

1980

# A study of factors measuring faculty job satisfaction at selected universities in Thailand

Sophon Sudsawasd  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Sudsawasd, Sophon, "A study of factors measuring faculty job satisfaction at selected universities in Thailand " (1980). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 6766.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/6766>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8019668

SUDSAWASD, SOPHON

A STUDY OF FACTORS MEASURING FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION AT  
SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN THAILAND

*Iowa State University*

PH.D.

1980

University

Microfilms

International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

A study of factors measuring faculty job  
satisfaction at selected universities in Thailand

by

Sophon Sudsawasd

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education  
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa  
1980

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Statement of Purposes	3
Basic Assumptions	5
Definition of Terms	6
Limitation of the Study	8
Hypotheses	9
Organization of the Study	10
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Conceptual Framework of Job Satisfaction	12
Studies Related to the Relationship Between Some Independent Variables and Level of Job Satisfaction	21
Studies on Related Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of American Faculty Members	29
Studies on Related Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of Thai School Teachers, College and University Faculty Members	36
Summary of Literature Review	40
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	42
Selection of the Sample	42
The Research Instrument	46
Collection of the Data	49
Statistical Treatment of Data	50
CHAPTER IV. REPORT OF THE FINDINGS	51
General Characteristics of the Sample	51

	Page
Factors Measuring Job Satisfaction Ratings	54
Test of the Hypotheses	78
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	91
Summary	91
Conclusions and Implications	94
Recommendations for Future Research	97
REFERENCES	99
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	107
APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE (English Version)	109
APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE (Thai Version)	116

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to investigate and analyze the factors affecting faculty job satisfaction and dissatisfaction at two selected universities in Thailand. A review of Thai literature has indicated that there are a limited number of studies available to researchers with reference to the area of investigation. Relatively few studies have had as their main concern the morale of teachers at school or college levels.

In the United States, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction has been subject of more than 3,350 articles, books, and dissertations (Locke, 1976). Yet, despite this vast output, many researchers are dissatisfied with the progress that has been made in understanding job satisfaction. For decades, researchers have tried to understand employee morale and to establish relationships between job satisfaction and productivity, absenteeism, and other independent variables (Cohen, 1974). While the concept of job satisfaction and its causes and effects have been studied in a great variety of organizational settings, few studies have been pursued in institutions of higher education. During the past few years, there are some improvements in the faculty job satisfaction area (Neumann, 1978). This may be caused by the fact that faculty members do not tend to consider themselves

as workers; therefore, the literature of business and industry for models or theories to use in describing the activities is not applicable to them. Another reason may be that the number of scholarly publications produced by faculty members and the number of hours per week spent in teaching can be counted, but the quality of the production is difficult to ascertain and almost impossible to attribute to any type of industrial organizational environment (Cohen, 1974). Still, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in institutions of higher education and problems of imprecise dependent variables should not be overlooked by researchers.

In Thailand, with an expansion of the industrial sectors, many teaching staff have resigned to assume jobs in industry (Pasuwan, 1972). It seems clear that faculty members have left the institution or have transferred from one institution to another because of circumstances over which the institution had no control. For example, a faculty member may seek to gain meaningful experience in the next job. Another may want to be mobile only as a result of a better offer, but not as a result of dissatisfaction with his current job. However, some faculty members have left because of institution failure to exercise control in job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Good administrators must realize that a high rate of turnover of faculty members would undoubtedly result in a faculty of limited



commitment, ineffective curriculum development, and faculty unrest. It can be costly both to the reputation of the college and to the well-being of the students (Nicholson and Miljus, 1972).

The literature indicates that job satisfaction is a prerequisite to long tenure and good performance, and hence to institutional effectiveness (Wood, 1976). Therefore, it seems wise to identify factors that affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the faculty members in order to determine whether any problem areas exist. Following the findings, the institution should be able to remedy problems and provide opportunities for faculty advancement and promotion.

#### Statement of Purposes

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not selected factors are related to faculty job satisfaction and dissatisfaction at two selected universities in Thailand. It is an attempt to find out how faculty members feel about their jobs. What pleases them in their work? What are the intrinsic rewards they attain? What brings dissatisfaction or tends to frustrate them? Knowledge of such factors may be used in the following manner:

1. As a managerial guide for administrators in area of faculty retention. If certain factors appear to be related to the formation of positive job attitudes, institu-

tional administrators can manipulate the environments in such a manner as to promote a reasonably high level of job satisfaction.

2. To provide relevant information for influencing prospective students to consider careers in university teaching, research and administration.

3. To provide insight into those variables associated with the formation of job satisfaction attitudes of Thai faculty members.

4. To provide an awareness of factors associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction which may help staff recruitment.

In developing the theoretical framework, this researcher has elected to deal with the Herzberg Two-factor Theory of job satisfaction (Herzberg et al. 1959). In this regard, the study draws 10 major factors corresponding to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the Herzberg Two-factor Theory to determine whether or not such selected factors are related to job satisfaction of Thai faculty members.

Therefore, this study is an attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Do the selected factors measure job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of Thai faculty members in the two selected universities?

2. What are the characteristics of those most satisfied

and the least satisfied groups?

3. Are Thai faculty members in significant agreement on the factors measuring their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction?

4. Is the pattern of job attitudes of Thai faculty members similar to the pattern found in the Herzberg job satisfaction model?

5. Is it possible to speculate that the two-factor theory is adaptable to the teaching staff in institutions of higher education in Thailand?

#### Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions for this study include the following:

1. There are certain factors that relate to the employment of faculty members that affect their job satisfaction.

2. The sample of 300 faculty members is representative of the population of faculty members in the two selected Thai universities.

3. Because data used in this study were collected through a survey questionnaire completed by faculty members in the sample, it is assumed that respondents were truthful in expressing attitudes towards their jobs.

4. Faculty members are more effective and productive if they are satisfied with their jobs.

5. The value of the findings will be increased considerably if the factors that cause dissatisfaction can be improved or eliminated and the factors that increase faculty job satisfaction can be maintained in the two institutions.

#### Definition of Terms

Terms used in this study and the data collection instrument are defined as follows:

Job Satisfaction - Morale: A number of Thai investigations carried on in the field were concerned with what was tentatively called job satisfaction. But many researchers use this term interchangeably with morale.

Job Satisfaction: The condition of contentment with one's work and its environment, denoting a favorable viewpoint of the individual toward the work role he/she presently occupies. This term is used interchangeably with job attitudes since both refer to the affective orientation of the individual toward the work role he/she is occupying.

Job Dissatisfaction: The condition of discontent with one's work and its environment, denoting an unfavorable viewpoint of the individual toward the work role he/she currently occupies.

Motivator Factors: Those factors that are inside, or a part of the actual job task or derive from performance of the job, i.e., achievement, recognition, growth, responsibility.

ity, and the work itself. This term is used interchangeably with intrinsic job factors.

Hygiene Factors: Factors that are a part of the job environment or the context within which the work is performed, i.e., interpersonal relations, organizational policy and administration, working conditions, supervision, and salary. This term is used interchangeably with extrinsic job factors.

Achievement: To complete a job successfully, to experience a personal success, to experience solution of a difficult problem.

Growth: To move upward within the organization or to advance one's own skills in the profession.

Interpersonal Relations: To experience either satisfying or dissatisfying social interactions with people in the performance of one's job.

Organizational Policy and Administration: The rules, regulations, and operating procedures under which one works.

Recognition: To be singled out for praise for a job well done.

Responsibility: To refer to satisfaction or lack of it derived from the level of responsibility and authority given to a person.

The Work Itself: To like or dislike the actual tasks involved in performing the job.

Working Conditions: The physical conditions or facilities in which and with which faculty members work.

Supervision: The competence of the supervisor and his/her willingness to delegate responsibility and authority and to train subordinates.

Salary: The amount stated in one's contract or all sequence of events in which compensation plays a role.

Overall Satisfaction: The objective rating given by a faculty members as to his/her total satisfaction in his/her present position.

Independent or Personal Variables: The variables relate to characteristics and aspects of the individual faculty member, i.e., age, sex, marital status, and highest level of formal education attained.

#### Limitations of the Study

The conclusion of this study can not be generalized to all faculty members across Thailand. The conclusions will be restricted to the two universities from which the sample is drawn. Some other limitations include:

1. The study is limited to 300 full-time faculty members of two universities in Thailand during the first semester of the academic year 1979-80.
2. The factors used in the analysis to determine those that measure faculty job satisfaction are limited to the factors that were included in the questionnaire instrument.

3. Special consideration should be given to the fact that the questionnaire instrument was originally constructed for use in the United States. It is possible that some of the items in the instrument may have different connotations in the two countries although the translation is correct. Therefore, the findings of this study were based on the Thai version of the questionnaire.

#### Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no significant differences among faculty members of different age levels regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.
2. There is no significant difference between male and female faculty members regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.
3. There is no significant difference between married and unmarried faculty members regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.
4. There are no significant differences among faculty members with different number of years of service regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.
5. There are no significant differences among faculty members with different levels of formal education regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.
6. There is no significant difference between faculty

members engaged in teaching and research, and faculty members engaged in academic administration regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.

7. There are no significant differences among faculty members of different academic ranks regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.

#### Organization of the Study

The report of this study is organized in the following manner: Chapter I presents a statement of the problem, a statement of purposes, definitions of terms, limitation of the study, and hypotheses. Chapter II reviews literature and research findings to be most relevant to the present study. Chapter III presents a detailed explanation of the procedures used for collecting the data, selecting the sample, and analyzing the data. Chapter IV gives the analysis of the data resulting from the questionnaire and the statistical treatment of these data in both descriptive and tabular forms. The final chapter, Chapter V, contains a summarization of the findings of this study with the conclusions and suggestions for further research based on the findings.



## CHAPTER II.

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature related to factors affecting job satisfaction of faculty members both in the United States and Thailand. Because few studies have been concerned directly with factors or aspects affecting faculty job satisfaction, it may be necessary in many cases to cite research of other groups for findings which may have relevance to faculty members.

The review is intended to include the job satisfaction literature appearing in Frederick Herzberg's first publication. Herzberg et al.(1957) undertook an extensive review of the literature which appeared prior to 1957. Although the publication is not involved directly with faculty job satisfaction, it appears to combine job satisfaction literature up to 1957 which is a relevant source to the researcher in development of his theoretical framework for research in this area.

In summary, the literature review will be arranged in the following sequence: (1) studies related to the conceptual framework of job satisfaction, (2) studies related to the relationships between some independent variables and level of job satisfaction, (3) studies on related factors affecting job satisfaction of American faculty members, and (4) studies on related factors affecting job satisfaction of Thai school teachers, college and university faculty members.

### Conceptual Framework of Job Satisfaction

This section is an attempt to examine the conceptual framework of job satisfaction in terms of basic psychological theories. Currently, there are a number of major theoretical positions that could be adopted relative to the job satisfaction in the work environments. However, the theories discussed will include the traditional approach, two-factor theory, and the need hierarchy.

#### The Traditional Approach

Early research in the area of job satisfaction employed the traditional approach. This approach was generally predicted on the assumption that if the presence of a variable in the work situation leads to satisfaction, then its absence will lead to job dissatisfaction, and vice versa (Ewen et al. 1966). This is the basis for the traditional theory of job satisfaction: it sees the individual shifting along a single continuum in response to changes in the job, both intrinsic and extrinsic to the work role.

Thus, if money is seen as contributing to satisfaction more money should lead to greater satisfaction and less money to dissatisfaction which can be illustrated as follows:

If a worker earns \$200 a month and he gets a \$40 increase, he will be pushed further on the satisfaction continuum than if he received a \$20 increase. If he has his salary up by \$20, he will accordingly be pushed on the continuum toward the dissatisfaction end (Behling et al. 1968).

If all other things are held constant, which is entirely unfeasible, this traditional approach might be related to the life situation. But this approach has been challenged because it fails to take expectations into account about worker's attitudes. For example, if one expects a 8% increase in salary but receives only a 4% increase, he may be pushed toward dissatisfaction even though he has received more pay (Cohen, 1974).

The traditional approach has much logic but has also been criticized as too simplistic an approach to the problem. Perhaps satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not polar opposites and same factors do not propel the worker in one direction or the other. However, certain researchers still advocate the traditional approach as the valid one (Hulin and Smith, 1967).

#### Two-Factor Theory

The findings of Herzberg and associates opened a new chapter in the area of job satisfaction. In 1959, Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman formulated the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. Using the critical incident method, these investigators interviewed 203 engineers and accountants employed by firms in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The research method included asking the individuals to describe specific instances when they felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their jobs:

The respondent was told that he could start with any kind of story you like - either a time when you felt exceptionally good or a time when you felt exceptionally bad about your job, either a long-range sequences of events or a short-range incident. After the first sequence was completely explored. The respondent was asked for a second. This time he was given somewhat less freedom to choose the kind of story. If he was given a high, he was then asked for a low; if he had given a long-range sequence, he was asked for a short-range one (Herzberg et al. 1959).

Following analysis of data, Herzberg and associates concluded that there is one set of factors, the presence of which induces increased job satisfaction, but the absence of which does not induce job dissatisfaction; and there is another set of factors, the absence of which leads to job dissatisfaction but the presence of which does not lead to increased job satisfaction. Cummings and ElSalmi (1968) attempted to simplify the findings:

What Herzberg is saying is that there are some factors that affect job attitudes only in the positive direction, thus leading to increased job satisfaction, but the absence of these factors would not necessarily give rise to job dissatisfaction. On the other hand, there are a group of factors acting as dissatisfiers which when absent, would lead to dissatisfaction but, when present, would not lead to job satisfaction.

Herzberg et al. termed the first set of factors as "motivators" and the second set as "hygienes". The motivators are: recognition, achievement, advancement, responsibility, and the work itself. These variables have also been termed intrinsic or work content variables, because they are all presumably derived from performance of the job itself.

The hygiene factors are: interpersonal relations with peers and supervisors, company policy and administration, superior's technical competence, working conditions, and job security. Hygiene factors have also been referred to as extrinsic or work-context conditions because they are all derived from the environment surrounding the job. Together the two sets of factors or conditions became well-known as "Herzberg's Two-factor Theory".

The two-factor theory stimulated a number of studies, many of which used the critical incident techniques that Herzberg et al. had employed in their own studies. Some studies supported Herzberg's conclusions but others failed to replicate their findings (Cohen, 1974). A number of empirical studies designed to test the validity of the two-factor theory were published, and a heated controversy has developed between supporters and critics of the theory (King, 1976).

Some replication studies support Herzberg's conclusions with their own data and some show its ability to be generalized to other subject population, occupations, cultures (Bloom and Barry, 1967; Allen, 1967; Myers, 1964). Other studies have attempted to relate the two-factor theory to various demographic variables and replicated the same findings as shown in the theory (Schwartz, Jenusaitis and Stark, 1963). In educational settings, Leon (1974) found the two-

factor theory was applicable among college and university professors in his study.

On the negative side, a major portion of the controversy stems from the lack of an explicit statement of the theory (King, 1976). In summary, the two factor-theory has been criticized on four basic categories:

1. The theory is bound to one methodology. The theory works well when the "Critical Incident" is employed, but is not so readily replicated when a structured questionnaire approach and factor analysis techniques are used (Ewen, 1964; Lindsay, Marks, and Gorlow, 1967). House and Wigdor (1967) reached conclusions contradictory to the two-factor theory when different research strategies were employed.

2. The methodology is weak. There is a lack of validity of the raw data obtained when the critical incident method is employed (Lindsay, Marks, and Gorlow, 1967) and such data may reflect subject's defensiveness (Vroom, 1964; Schneider and Locke, 1971). The method, when employed alone, is biased because it is easy for respondents to recall incidents in which they felt good as being brought on by their own accomplishments (i.e., promotions, achievement, etc.) but difficult to recall those which follow no achievement (House and Wigdor, 1967; Ewen, 1964).

3. Both motivators and hygienes can cause either satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The two sets of factors are

not unidimensional but contribute to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Wolf, 1967). Ewen et al. (1966) found that motivators were more strongly related to both overall satisfaction and overall dissatisfaction than the hygienes. Lahiri and Srivastva (1967) indicated that motivators also can act as dissatisfiers but to a lesser extent than as satisfiers; and hygienes act more as satisfiers than as dissatisfiers. Dunnette et al. (1967) found that recognition, a motivator, was the third most common cause of dissatisfaction.

4. The theory is too rigid, oversimplified and contrived and does not take enough individual differences into consideration (Lahiri and Srivastva, 1967). There is much more to job satisfaction than merely two sets of factors. For example, Robinson et al. (1966) reported a study showing that satisfaction increased with age up to certain level.

It seems clear that the validity of the two-factor theory presented above remains a highly controversial topic. As Behling et al. (1968) observe, "research using the Herzberg's critical incident method gives result supporting the Herzberg duality". And that "research using other methods of gathering data produces results which conflict with the Herzberg approach and support a uniscalar theory of job satisfaction".

In summary, although the two-factor theory may have

detractors, it does seem useful to test this theory in an institution of higher learning as a means of learning more about faculty members and the university as a work environment. If the two-factor theory holds, then satisfaction should be related to intrinsic while dissatisfaction should be associated with factors of the environment extrinsic to the faculty members.

### The Need Hierarchy

An important weakness of the two-factor theory is its lack of flexibility in explaining differences in individual personality needs. Some studies suggest that job satisfaction can be estimated directly from the measurement of varying degrees of need satisfaction (Blai, 1963; Kuhlen, 1976).

Because of these results, a number of need theories appeared operative as a fertile ground for explanation. The "need hierarchy" theory of A. H. Maslow became one of the most significant in job satisfaction studies. Maslow (1970) proposed the idea that an individual's needs develop in a sequence from "lower order" to "higher order" needs. The hierarchy he posited consisted of five plateaus: First, physiological needs; second, safety and security needs; third, social-affection needs; fourth, esteem needs; and finally, self-actualization needs. Only after the lower needs are satisfied does a person become concerned with



fulfilling the higher order needs, since it is only the unfulfilled needs which motivate the individual. Prien, Barrett, and Svetlik (1967), in pointing to the most general application of the concept in relation to work, stated that:

The traditional view that man works only because of necessity to survive must give way to the view that work itself is or can be rewarding.

As applied to the work place, the theory implies that work may be able to fulfill needs higher than those that are merely physiological.

In support of the need hierarchy approach, many studies have found that self-actualization and autonomy, or the highest need categories, were felt to be most important and least fulfilled across most levels of management (Porter, 1963). It was also found that job security is a major concern of all groups of workers (Dufty, 1967). Both of these ideas are consistent with Maslow's theory since only a few groups seem to have fulfilled the highest needs whereas all are concerned with the more basic.

The need hierarchy theory has been useful to the understanding of behavior in the work environment. In a broad sense, the theory indicates that the satisfied employee has a greater probability of attaining self-actualization and mental health than the dissatisfied employee. By implication, it becomes necessary for organizations to find ways of satisfying both lower and higher level needs by

providing the employee with opportunity for growth and responsibility.

However, the needs may not always occur in order with clear distinction between the various levels (Hodgetts, 1975). From the hierarchy point of view, some needs are, to some extent, difficult to categorize. For example, money could either be used to buy food and clothing thereby fulfilling one's physiological need or be used as a means to obtaining one's status and recognition which can gratify one's social and esteem needs (Sutermester, 1976). In the previous empirical studies, using Maslow's framework, the findings do not generally support Maslow's claims (Hall and Nougaim, 1968). On the contrary, in review of research on the need hierarchy theory, Wahba and Bridwell (1976) found only partial support for the concept of need hierarchy. Some of Maslow's propositions are totally rejected, while other received mixed and questionable support (Wahba and Bridwell, 1976).

In view of job satisfaction, a number of studies attempt to synthesize the conceptual frameworks used by both Maslow and Herzberg (Lahiri and Srivastva, 1967; Ewen, 1964). This is due to the fact that the extrinsic or hygiene factors of Herzberg related directly to Maslow's lower-order needs and the intrinsic or motivator factors were more closely with higher-order needs. Such a synthesis of the two conceptual frameworks appears to point in the direction of a

more workable and realistic pattern of job satisfaction.

It is hoped that such an approach may provide more insight into the problems being studied.

Studies Related to the Relationship  
Between Some Independent Variables and Level  
of Job Satisfaction

Some researchers have reported there are many independent variables such as sex, marital status, age, education, number of years employed which have been significantly correlated with job satisfaction. In an attempt to identify factors affecting job satisfaction, one has to realize the significance of personal as well as organizational factors. In this section, some independent variables will be examined in order to construct research hypotheses.

Age and Job Satisfaction

Herzberg et al. (1957) reviewed 23 studies in the analysis of the change in job attitudes with changing age. In 17 out of 23 studies on the job satisfaction of workers at various age levels, they found the following U-shaped curve:

Morale is high when people start their first job; it goes down during the next few years, and remains at a relatively low level; when workers are in their late twenties or early thirties morale begins to rise. This rise continues through the remainder of the working career in most cases.

This U-shaped model was not supported by Hulin and

Smith (1965), who found that age has a positive monotonic relationship to job satisfaction. However, a slight modification of the model was proposed by Saleh and Otis (1976). For managerial employees, they found that job satisfaction increased up to sixty years and then declined with approaching retirement. Their explanation was that the increase until about age of 60 was seen as the general adjustment to life. The decline between the age of 60 and 65 was partially due to decline in physical health, but mainly to the blockage of channels for self-actualization and psychological growth (Saleh and Otis, 1976). Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that most of the above cited studies concerned blue and white collar workers in industrial settings.

In educational institutions, a number of studies found significant relationships between job satisfaction and age. Sprague (1974), in his study of job satisfaction of university faculty, reported a positive relationship between age of faculty and employee job satisfaction. Earlier research findings of employee satisfaction in the North Carolina community college system supported the association between job satisfaction and faculty age (Rollins, 1973). Probe (1971) also reported significant relationship between teacher job satisfaction and age.

In a Thai study of morale of university personnel, Petput (1971) also reported an increase in job satisfaction

of teaching and support staff as age increased. Panmuk (1975), in his investigation of factors in motivating agriculture teachers to work in the secondary schools in Thailand, found positive relationship between age of teachers and job satisfaction, particularly with respect to supervision received.

#### Sex and Job Satisfaction

The male-female differential in job satisfaction has some interesting results. Of 21 studies reviewed by Herzberg et al. (1957), 6 of the studies found women to be more satisfied than men; 3 of them showed women were less satisfied than men; and 5 of them showed no difference between men and women. Herzberg and associates concluded that the studies comparing men and women in job satisfaction did not lead to any simple conclusions about such differences. Hulin and Smith (1976), from a sample of 295 male and 163 female workers drawn from 4 different plants, found that males were more satisfied than female counterparts. Kuhlen (1976) reported males and females require different satisfactions from their job.

The relationships found in educational settings support the findings of Herzberg and associates in terms of no clear-cut pattern. Some studies revealed significant differences between job satisfaction and sex (Parker, 1974; and Hafen, 1971). Parker (1974) reported the significant differences

between job satisfaction and sex of elementary school teachers. Sprague (1974) found no difference between job satisfaction and sex in his study of university faculty members. Merrill (1970) disclosed female teachers and principals were more satisfied in their jobs than their male colleagues.

In Thailand, Petput (1971) also disclosed in his study cited earlier that Thai female university personnel tended to be more satisfied than their male counterparts. However, this was not the case for school teachers in Bangkok and Northeastern Region of Thailand in which a study showed no difference between sex and level of job satisfaction (Chatatrakul, 1972).

#### Marital Status and Job Satisfaction

A number of studies on how job attitudes are related to marital status does not permit clear-cut conclusions to be drawn. Of 12 studies reviewed by Herzberg et al. (1957), 3 studies found married workers to be more satisfied than unmarried; one of them showed unmarried workers were more satisfied than married; and 8 of them showed no difference between married and unmarried workers in job attitudes.

In the educational institution, Lacy (1969) investigated factors that affect job satisfaction of public high school business teachers in Ohio. Among the findings, she reported no difference was shown in job attitudes between married and unmarried teachers. However, Becvar (1970) reported

different findings of first-year teachers with respect to job attitudes. It was found that married first-year teachers were more satisfied than unmarried peers (Becvar, 1970).

In a Thai study cited earlier, Petput (1971) summarized in his findings that no significant relationship was found between marital status and job satisfaction of Thai university personnel in his investigation. This seems to be contradictory to the findings of school teachers in Thailand. Two studies conducted by Yotakong (1976) and Panmuk (1975) reported positive relationship between marital status and job satisfaction of Thai teachers in their population.

#### Length of Service and Job Satisfaction

Herzberg et al. (1957) reviewed 17 studies to determine how job attitudes were related to length of service with the organization. Of these, 8 studies disclosed the same trend as studies relating to change in morale to age. Seven were not definite in their results. In all cases the problem under study was how a worker felt about his job versus how long he had been on that job. Herzberg and associates summarized the seventeen studies by making observation that:

These studies show the following trend: workers begin with high morale which drops during the first year of service and remains low for a number of years. As service increases, morale tends to go up.

Later research tended to support this point of view. For example, O'Reilly and Roberts (1975), in their study of

individual differences in personality, reported job satisfaction was significantly related to job tenure.

Thus far, no studies have been located which examined the length of service in relation to job satisfaction of American college and university faculty, but a number of studies of nonuniversity teachers confirmed that this variable is positively related. Lacy (1969) found that there was a significant relationship between level of job satisfaction of business teachers and length of service with the educational institution. Probe (1971) reported similar finding in his investigation of the relationship between public school teacher job satisfaction and selected personal characteristics.

As for the Thai studies, Petput (1971) supported the findings of positive relationship between job satisfaction and length of service. In other words, the longer the Thai university personnel were on the jobs, the more satisfied they were with their work.

#### Education and Job Satisfaction

Herzberg et al. (1957) reported 13 studies relating education to job attitudes. Of these studies, 3 studies showed an increase in morale with increase education; another 5 showed the higher these workers' educational level, the lower their morale; and the remaining studies showed no differences in job attitudes among workers differing in



education. Williamson and Karras (1970) asked 34 female clerical workers to rank 10 job characteristics taken from the Herzberg Two-factor Theory. The findings indicated that the female group with college educations ranked motivators significantly higher for self-actualization than those of female clerical workers without a college education. Klein and Maher (1976) conducted a study of first-level managers in an electronics manufacturing population. Among the conclusions, they reported college educated managers to be less satisfied with pay compared to a noncollege education group. This finding may not be generalized to nonmanagerial groups, where the study of England and Stein (1976) showed higher education level to be related positively to job satisfaction.

In the educational institution, Varley (1973) reported the results of his study of 436 teachers in 14 metropolitan high schools that teachers who graduated from teachers' colleges were relatively satisfied with their work. Hollon and Gremmill (1976) conducted a study of 321 full-time teaching professionals in 7 two-year public community colleges. They disclosed that female teaching professionals reportedly experience less overall job satisfaction than their male colleagues.

Petput (1971) also found Thai university personnel with higher level of education were more satisfied in their jobs than their peers at lower levels of educational background.

### Academic Responsibility and Job Satisfaction

This is an attempt to determine whether or not faculty members who were engaged in teaching and research were less satisfied or more satisfied than those faculty members who were engaged in academic administration. It was not intended as matter of questioning a response as to which of the typical assigned tasks, i.e., teaching, research, and academic administration was of more important.

However, no guidance is found in the empirical literature on American studies with respect to the specific variable that the researcher wished to explore. Only a small section of the Thai study conducted by Petput (1971) focused on this question. Thai university personnel with teaching responsibility were found to be in higher morale compared with their colleagues who were engaged in academic administration and support functions.

### Academic Rank and Job Satisfaction

The relationship between rank and job satisfaction seems difficult to interpret. Herzberg et al. (1957) have indicated that one unequivocal fact emerged from their studies included a wide range of occupations ranging from unskilled laborers through professional and managerial positions. Herzberg and associates concluded that there is good support for the assumption that job satisfaction increases

as the employee takes an increased responsibility and authority in the organization.

In the academic institution, Field (1966), in his study of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of University of Wisconsin faculty members by campus location, reported that associate professors comprised the most dissatisfied academic rank among the sample.

Studies on Related Factors  
Affecting Job Satisfaction of American  
Faculty Members

Studies related to this topic have apparently reflected different populations and sample sizes, and diverse variables. However, comparison of the findings of this study with studies of a similar nature may provide a basis on which to draw general conclusions regarding factors affecting the faculty job satisfaction in general and the selected Thai universities in particular.

Field and Giles (1977) investigated the dimension of faculty members' sensitivity to job satisfaction items. The population of the study were 888 full-time teaching faculty members of a large, southeastern university who were randomly selected from the university's personnel roster. Based upon 52 percent response rate, the results revealed that faculty members' sensitivity of job satisfaction items centered primarily in their concern with extrinsic job factors, department head action, and promotion and salary.

Such findings might be turned out as a result of organizational setting where job satisfaction seemed relatively high.

Neumann (1978) also attempted to examine the relationship between several dimensions of organizational climate and faculty job satisfaction in university departments by using data which were based on a second phase of a longitudinal study. His major conclusion was that the organizational climate was one of the keys leading to faculty job satisfaction.

Smart and Morstain (1975) used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith et al. (1969) as an instrument for the measurement of job satisfaction among college administrators. A total of 713 questionnaires was returned from all members of the Association for Institutional Research (AIR), a return of 68 percent. This study revealed that college administrators whose preferred and perceived job responsibilities were most congruent tend to find work to be more challenging, fascinating, and satisfying than their moderate and incongruent colleagues. Congruent administrators perceived their work as providing an outlet for their creative energies, being useful to their institutions and respected by their colleagues within the institutions, and providing a sense of accomplishment in their lives.

Cohen (1974) employed the critical incident method in conducting a study of faculty job satisfaction in twelve

community colleges. During the summer of 1973 the author forwarded questionnaires to 57 instructors at a small college in Southern California; 19 instructors at nine colleges in an Eastern State, and 146 instructors at a larger college in Northern California. Respondents were asked to relate aspects of their work that led them to feel satisfied and aspects that led them toward feeling dissatisfied. The results disclosed that more than two-thirds of the groups indicated they gained satisfaction from interaction with students. They related administration and organizational difficulties as leading to dissatisfaction. Thus, the findings supported the Herzberg Two-factor Theory.

Wood (1973) investigated the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of full-time faculty in the North Carolina Community College System. The research instrument was developed on the basis of ten factors selected from the Herzberg Two-factor Theory. The population studied was composed of full-time faculty members representing 6 community colleges and 11 technical institutions of the North Carolina Community College System; 224 faculty members in the sample population responded to the mailed questionnaire. Correlational coefficients and regression analyses were used in manipulating the data. The findings generally supported the Herzberg Two-factor Theory pertaining to motivator factors which were significantly more associated with overall job satisfaction

than were the hygiene factors. Among the demographic variables tested, age was shown to have a positive, significant relation to total job satisfaction.

Nicholson and Miljus (1972) conducted a study of job satisfaction and turnover among liberal arts college professors. During the academic year 1968-69, the questionnaires were sent to all faculty members at twenty-one liberal arts colleges in Ohio, requesting both biographical data and attitudinal data. Faculty respondents were asked to indicate, on a five point scale, how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with each of forty six factors of employment. The results indicated that, on the whole, the liberal arts college faculty were satisfied with conditions of employment, particularly the nature of their work, i.e., class size, courses taught, teaching load, and academic freedom. Congenial and competent colleagues also appeared to be a significant source of satisfaction for liberal arts professors.

The study concerned with job satisfaction of faculty members in Florida Community Junior Colleges was conducted by Kurt and Mills (1968). The population used in the study included all part-time and full-time teachers, administrators, and counselors employed by Florida's twenty-six community junior colleges which had been in operation for one year or longer. This study was aimed to examine the

degree of faculty job satisfaction with respect to various features, activities, programs, policies, organization, and conditions in their own junior colleges; and to determine the characteristics, opinions, and attitudes of those most satisfied and most dissatisfied. Significant findings drawn from the study indicated that the majority of the faculty were relatively satisfied with their profession, working conditions, community, associates, and students. An area of dissatisfaction concerned college organization and administration procedures, faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making, and adequacy of communication.

With such a large number of studies dealing with factors affecting job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in recent years, it is necessary to summarize some of the findings which may relate to this study.

Table 1. Summary of studies on factors affecting job satisfaction in the educational institution

Author	Type of population	Results	
		Dissatisfiers	Satisfiers
Tombaugh (1976)	School business administrators	Salary, superior, possibility of growth	Achievement, responsibility, recognition, work itself, policy and administration
Robbins (1975)	Professors of educational administration	Working conditions, interpersonal relation, policy and administration, resistance to change, and organizational failure	Self-recognition, self-achievement, student achievement, work itself, organizational achievement
Leon (1974)	College and university professors	Extrinsic or hygiene factors as defined by the two-factor theory	Intrinsic or motivator factors as defined by the two-factor theory
Wozniak (1973)	Music faculty in two-year colleges	Policy and administration, effect of job on personal life, working conditions, supervision and recognition	Achievement, work itself, responsibility, and personal relationship with students
Lee (1972)	School principals	Advancement, compensation, school policies	Social service, activity, achievement, morale value
Hutchinson (1972)	Classified school employees	Policy and administration	Work itself



Table 1. (Continued)

Author	Type of population	Results	
		Dissatisfiers	Satisfiers
Hammer (1971)	Special and regular teachers	Supervision, job security, interpersonal relations, policy and administration, salary, status, and working conditions	Growth, advancement and recognition
Hafen (1971)	Faculties of health education and university	Income	Work itself
Avakian (1971)	Faculty members from 2 colleges and universities	Policy administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations with administrators, colleagues, and subordinates	Achievement, recognition, work itself, possibility growth and responsibility (potential)
Merrill (1970)	Teachers and their building principals	Policy and practices, compensation, social status, advancement, authority, recognition	Creativity, social service, achievement, activity, and responsibility
Kennecke (1969)	Oregon industrial education	Economic conditions, working conditions, school administration	working conditions, teacher-student relationships, faculty interactions

Studies on Related Factors Affecting  
Job Satisfaction of Thai School Teachers, College and  
University Faculty Members

Research related to factors affecting job satisfaction, especially of faculty members, is limited in Thailand. Most of what is done in the field is being conducted by graduate students for thesis work. Also a review will include the research work done by a group of faculty in Social Sciences College, Kasetsart University, Bangkok relative to job satisfaction in terms of university faculty member work incentive.

Arayasart (1975) made a study of job satisfaction of school and college administrators under the Department of Vocational Education, Thailand by developing a questionnaire instrument based on the Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The population of this study included 136 school administrators and 27 college administrators. The results disclosed that both groups of school and college administrators were relatively satisfied in their work. When grouping and comparison were made, college administrators perceived higher level of job satisfaction than the school administrators. Both groups were highly satisfied with job security, interpersonal relationship, responsibility, and the work itself.

In a similar study, Chatatrakul (1972) examined the morale between school teachers in Bangkok and those in north-

eastern region of Thailand. One purpose of this study was to determine the degree of teachers' satisfaction with respect to working conditions, activities, interpersonal relationships, supervision, pay, opportunity for advancement, safety and social status in their employment regions. When comparison was made, the results indicated that school teachers in the northeastern region perceived higher satisfaction than their peers in Bangkok in the area of interpersonal relationship, activities, pay, safety and social status. However, school teachers in Bangkok were more satisfied with working conditions and opportunities for advancement. On the whole, school teachers in both locations were quite satisfied with their work roles.

Chancharoen (1976) reported an extensive study of morale of instructors in teacher colleges. This study included a sample population of full-time instructors representing 15 teacher colleges in Thailand. Of 480 instructors in the sample, 471 (98.13%) responded to the mailed questionnaire. Two-way analysis of variance was employed in handling the data. Among the conclusions in the study revealed that instructors whose primary responsibilities included both teaching and academic administration were more satisfied in their work than those who were assigned only teaching tasks. On the whole, the morale of both groups was moderately high.

Some factors in motivating agriculture teachers to work in the secondary schools under the General Education Department of Thailand was studied by Panmuk (1975). The factors investigated were conditions of employment, and fringe benefits. The findings gave considerable support for viewing salary, job safety, supervision, recognition, and fringe benefits as important dimensions of teacher satisfaction. Factors concerning working conditions and advancement were perceived as dissatisfiers by the agriculture teachers in the survey.

Another study of agriculture teachers by Yotakong (1976) arrived at the same general conclusions regarding the dimensions or factors affecting teacher satisfaction. He conducted a replicated study of the job satisfaction in the agriculture teachers' career under the Agriculture Schools and Colleges of Northeastern Region of Thailand. The results of his study supported general findings as reported by Panmuk (1975) except factors of employment relative to working conditions and advancement in which his respondents expressed more satisfaction than dissatisfaction.

In the institutions of higher learning in Thailand, a study of morale of university personnel was carried out by Petput (1971). The universe studied consisted of full-time faculty members and staff personnel of Kasetsart University in Bangkok. Respondents were asked to express their satis-

faction relative to working conditions, policy, supervision, interpersonal relationship, the work itself, fringe benefits, and personal life. They were also given the opportunity to suggest what they would like to see brought about in these areas. Of 712 faculty members and staff personnel in the sample, 294 (41.3%) responded to the mailed questionnaires. The results disclosed that approximately 60.0% of the respondents were considered in high morale and 38.0% of lower morale. With regard to satisfaction, the results indicated that faculty members and staff personnel expressed a greater degree of satisfaction with supervision, interpersonal relationship, and personal work life than other factors investigated. In summary, faculty members and staff personnel were quite satisfied with their positions.

In a similar study at the same university, Kapilakanchana et al. (1978) examined the work incentives of faculty members. Of 500 faculty members in the sample population, 300 responded to a series of questions concerning a number of factors in employment such as working conditions, job security, social acceptance, opportunity for advancement, and their expectations from work. Among the other conclusions, the results indicated that faculty members were dissatisfied with working conditions, particularly problems relative to telephone service, sanitation within the institution, parking, petty cash requests, postal service, health

service, and housing arrangements. They were relatively satisfied with social acceptance. In general, they were quite satisfied and their work roles were in line with the university's purposes in which emphases are placed in teaching, research, supporting and serving the society.

#### Summary of Literature Review

The literature review indicates a large portion of the job satisfaction research has progressed along with three major conceptual frameworks of analysis which have been identified as the traditional approach, the two-factor theory, and the need hierarchy. Each of the three approaches comes with its own set of assumptions and premises and thus is burdened with liabilities indigenous to those assumptions and premises. Each approach including some of its advantages and disadvantages is briefly discussed. It appears that these approaches have received their share of criticisms, particularly the two-factor theory. These criticisms, however, should not be allowed to dampen research into factors affecting job satisfaction.

Because the main purpose of this study is to determine whether or not the extrinsic and intrinsic factors derived from the two-factor theory are related to faculty job satisfaction, a weakness of the theory in terms of its lack of flexibility in explaining differences in individual personality needs is taken into consideration. An attempt has been

made to overcome such weakness by examining a number of independent variables such as sex, marital status, age, length of service and so forth in terms of their relationship with factors measuring job satisfaction.

In the educational institution, an increasing number of studies have been undertaken by researchers in the area of job satisfaction. Because some of these studies are not research in the strict sense and many of the studies reported employed questionnaire methods involving both large or small samples, extreme caution is then in order in attempting to make generalizations from the findings. Despite their nontechnical nature, they do provide insight and indicate the interest and concern felt by researchers relative to the whole field of job satisfaction.

### CHAPTER III.

#### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This research project was approved by the Human Subjects Committee of Iowa State University on July 13, 1979. The purpose of this chapter is to present the methods and procedures used in the sample selection, research instrument, collection of the data, and statistical treatment of data. The normative survey method was conducted in this study during the first semester of 1979-80 academic year. However, the selection of the sample and administration of the questionnaire instrument were accomplished in Thailand by Dr. Suriyan Nontasak of Sri Nakariniwiroth University and a number of his graduate assistants.

#### Selection of the Sample

The sample of faculty members was selected from two universities located in Bangkok and Bangsan. The two institutions may not constitute a large enough sample to be representative of all colleges and universities in country, but it was felt they might provide a large number of faculty representation of the range and diversity found in the institutions of higher learning in Thailand. Because faculty members are the primary focus of this study, the two universities were selected to assure that different kinds of university faculty could be studied. The institutions selected



are described briefly as they were at the time of study.

Sri Nakarinwirot University (SN)

This university changed from a College of Education to a university in 1974. In Thailand, teacher education has a long tradition, but it was not until 1954 that the institution was given the right to grant a Bachelor's degree in education. In the same year, the former Higher Teacher Training School at Prasarnmit, Bangkok, became the College of Education with authorization to grant a diploma in education and bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees. In 1955, two branches or campuses were added as affiliates: Bangsan and Patoomwan. Each branch offers a four-year program, but differs from the main campus, by only accepting upper secondary school or pre-university school graduates, whereas the main campus at Prasarnmit accepts students from lower institutions of teacher training. The Bangsan campus is located at about 50 kilometers east of Bangkok while the Patoomwan campus is in Bangkok area. Lately, five additional campuses located in Bangkok and different regions of Thailand were also added as affiliates.

This institution differs from the other universities in that it offers programs mainly for teacher education. The institution has grown rapidly and has 1,369 faculty members when this study was conducted. Although the faculty members were randomly selected from two campuses, Prasarnmit

and Bangsan, the selected samples should be representative of all the campuses affiliated with the university because of its nature and characteristics.

Thammasart University (TU)

This university was founded in 1933 as the University of Morale and Political Sciences. At that time, it was felt that more studies in the social sciences were needed, particularly political science, if the democratic ideology was to permeate the country. Until 1949, the only degree offered was the Bachelor of Law, though later courses were offered leading to Master's and Doctor's degrees in the same field. Also by 1949, the university set up faculties of law, commerce and accounting, political science and economics because the enrollment and numbers of courses had reached the point where it was felt that the separate faculties were needed. Later on, social administration, and liberal arts were added in 1954 and 1962 respectively.

As in other universities in the country, the Bachelor's programs are four years in length, with Master's and Doctor's degrees being offered in certain selected fields.

The criteria used for selecting Thammasart University were that the faculty members of this institution would mostly resemble the faculty members in other universities in Bangkok due to the urban setting in addition to institutional similarity in size and hierarchical structure. When the

study was conducted, there were 510 full-time faculty members in this institution.

### The Sample

For this study, 300 faculty members of the two universities were randomly selected from the 1979-80 university's personnel roster. The following criteria were used in selecting the sample:

1. The faculty members were employed full-time in the two selected universities.

2. Only faculty members with more than three months employment with vast majority having been employed for over one year were selected.

Such criteria for selecting the sample were determined on the basis of getting a representative sample from the total population of each selected university. The sample was limited to full-time faculty members because they are considered to be the core personnel who are principally responsible for determining the quality and effectiveness of the institution in carrying out its objectives and purposes.

An equal number of faculty members of the two institutions was selected for the sample to increase the probability of getting a representative sample from the population of each group.

### The Research Instrument

A comprehensive review of literature has indicated a number of research instruments have been used to determine the aspects and/or factors that have been found to affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of various groups. The questionnaire instrument constructed by O. R. Wood in 1973 for use in his study appears to be the most feasible instrument for the Herzberg Two-factor Theory in determining factors affecting academic personnel in the education institution. In 1977, this instrument was used in the study of job satisfaction of faculty and staff at the College of Eastern Utah (Seegmiller, 1977).

Because this instrument was validated and used successfully in the two previous studies, the researcher decided to use the same basic instrument in his study.

#### Description of the Questionnaire

As cited in the literature review, Herzberg et al. (1959) formulated the two-factor theory of job satisfaction which separates satisfaction and dissatisfaction by relating the first to "motivator" or "intrinsic" and the second to "hygiene" or "extrinsic". In applying this theory, Wood (1973) used three types of information: demographic items, items representing the ten selected motivation-hygiene factors, and a single item which provided an indication of overall job satisfaction. Items representative of the

selected motivation-hygiene factors include the following:

<u>Motivator or</u> <u>Intrinsic Factors</u>	<u>Hygiene or</u> <u>Extrinsic Factors</u>
Achievement	Organizational Policy and Administration
Recognition	Supervision
Responsibility	Salary
Possibility of Growth	Working Conditions
Work Itself	Interpersonal Relations

The questionnaire consists of 68 five-response-choice-items scoring on the ten selected factors. The respondent was advised to ask himself how he felt about each item on his present job. Five response alternatives and their scoring weight are determined as follows:

<u>Response Choice</u>	<u>Scoring Weight</u>
Very satisfied	5 (A)
Slightly to moderately satisfied	4 (B)
Not sure of opinion or neutral	3 (C)
Slightly to moderately dissatisfied	2 (D)
Very dissatisfied	1 (E)

#### Translation of the Questionnaire

Before the study progressed, permission was obtained from O. R. Wood to use and translate the instrument for a study in Thailand.

In the beginning, the researcher translated the instruction and items of the original version of the questionnaire

from English into Thai language. In review of translation problems, a group of four Thai graduate students currently enrolled at Iowa State University was formed to check translation errors and to recommend the most suitable terms for revision. Apparently, most of the items were not difficult to translate. However, several items were discussed until a consensus was reached on their translation. In such cases, slight changes were entered to make the instrument more applicable to the population to which they would be administered. At least, the translated version appeared satisfactory for further study.

#### Pretest

A sample of twelve Thai graduate students currently enrolled at Iowa State University was selected for the pretest. Those participating in the pretest were chosen based on their academic positions in the home country. The questionnaire was delivered to them on July 14, 1979 for testing. A copy of the cover letter and one of the questionnaire are included in Appendix A. The participant was given ample opportunity to comment on the instrument. Ten of the questionnaires were returned with comments and suggestions, some items were ambiguous. In accordance with valuable suggestions received, the ambiguous items in the questionnaire were substantially revised without changing the meaning of the original version of the instrument.

It appeared that survey instrument was feasible for further use with the sample selected.

#### Collection of the Data

Following the selection of sample, the questionnaire packets were assembled. These packets included a copy of the cover letter and one of the questionnaire. The cover letter stated the auspices under which the study was being conducted and the anticipated benefits of the study and encouraged the faculty's participation. To assure anonymity each respondent was asked to complete the questionnaire and mail it direct to the sender or through personal delivery.

It was intended that approximately 300 faculty members would be sampled from the two selected institutions. These questionnaires were mailed to all randomly selected faculty members on August 10, 1979. A follow-up letter and a ques-

Table 2. Numbers of distribution and percentages of questionnaire returned by each university

Institution	Number sent	Number returned	Percent returned
Sri Nakarinwirot University	150	103	72.0
Thammasart University	150	78	52.0
Total	300	186	62.0

tionnaire were sent on October 1, 1979, to those who had not responded to the first mailing of the questionnaire.

An analysis of the total returns according to each selected university is shown in Table 2.

### Statistical Treatment of Data

Each returned questionnaire was carefully examined to make sure that each question had been answered. If it contained five or more unanswered items, it was considered invalid and was eliminated. The usable questionnaires were punched on IBM cards. These punched cards were then programmed and computer analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) at the Computer Center of Iowa State University.

Primary analysis of the data was completed through application of the crosstabulations, chi-square, one-way analysis of variance, and t-tests. This statistical techniques are shown in detail in the SPSS Manual (Nie et al. 1975) and will not be described in this chapter.

The results of the statistical data analysis will be presented in Chapter IV. A discussion of the conclusions, implications, and recommendations which derive from this analysis will be found in Chapter V.



## CHAPTER IV.

## REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the research findings generated from analysis of the questionnaires sent to faculty members of the two selected institutions. All responses were coded, key-punched on IBM card and analyzed by computer using the programming of Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The results will be presented in three sections: (1) general characteristics of the sample, (2) the rating of factors measuring job satisfaction, and in comparison with the two-factor theory, and (3) the results of statistical tests of the null hypotheses.

General Characteristics of the Sample

The initial section of the instrument asked the sample to respond to seven personal variables: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) marital status, (4) number of years employed, (5) highest level of formal education, (6) professional rank, and (7) primary responsibility. Table 3 summarizes these data.

Data in Table 3 comparing SN faculty with TU faculty member indicate equally of males and females. In the various categories, SN faculty drew members with more relative frequency from married (67.0%), from the 41 and over age

Table 3. General characteristics of the sample of each university selected

Characteristics	Sri Nakarinwirot University (SN)		Thammasart University (TU)	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Age:</b>				
25 or less	3	2.8	4	5.1
26 - 30	10	9.3	16	20.5
31 - 35	18	16.7	24	30.8
36 - 40	26	24.0	19	24.4
41 or over	51	47.2	15	19.2
Totals	108	100.0	78	100.0
<b>Sex:</b>				
Male	52	48.1	36	46.2
Female	56	51.9	42	53.8
Totals	108	100.0	78	100.0
<b>Marital status:</b>				
Married	73	67.0	43	55.1
Unmarried	35	33.0	35	44.9
Totals	108	100.0	78	100.0
<b>Number of years employed:</b>				
Less than one year	2	1.8	8	10.3
1 - 5 years	23	31.3	15	19.2
6 - 10 years	29	26.9	31	39.7
11 years or longer	54	50.0	24	30.8
Totals	108	100.0	78	100.0

Table 3. (Continued)

Characteristics	Sri Nakarinwirot University (SN)		Thammasart University (TU)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Highest level of education:				
Bachelor's degree	19	17.6	10	12.8
Master's degree	75	69.4	47	60.3
Doctoral degree	8	7.4	18	23.1
Others	6	5.6	3	3.8
Totals	108	100.0	78	100.0
Academic rank				
Instructors	50	46.4	40	51.3
Assistant professors	44	40.7	36	46.1
Associate professors	9	8.3	2	2.6
Professors	1	0.9	-	-
Others (not in academic ranks)	4	3.7	-	-
Totals	108	100.0	78	100.0
Primary responsibility:				
Teaching	39	36.1	30	38.5
Research	3	2.8	1	1.3
Teaching and research	32	29.6	26	33.3
Academic administration	3	2.8	6	7.7
Teaching and academic administration	31	28.7	15	19.2
Totals	108	100.0	78	100.0

bracket (47.2%), from the highest level of formal education of Master's degree (69.4%), from the academic rank of instructor (46.4%), and from the primary responsibility of teaching (36.1%). TU faculty members had more female members (53.8), drew with more relative frequency from married (55.1%), from the 31-35 years old bracket (30.8%), from the 6-10 years employed bracket (39.7%), from the highest level of formal education of Master's degree (60.3%), from the professional rank of instructor (51.3%), and from the primary responsibility of teaching (38.5%).

#### Factors Measuring Job Satisfaction Ratings

The respondents were presented with a list of sixty-six job-related motivator and hygiene factors and asked to rate these factors on a five point scale ranging from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied" as to their being satisfied with their jobs. A value of "1" was assigned to the responses "very dissatisfied" and a value of "5" to the responses: "very satisfied". A respondent's response of "1" indicated the lowest possible level of job satisfaction; conversely, a respondent's response value of "5" indicated the highest possible level of job satisfaction. Table 4 exhibits numbers and percentage of total responses the ratings each group gave these factors.

The responses were compared with each other by means of crosstabulations and Chi-square tests.

Table 4. Percentage of distribution of responses by each factor item

1. Achievement		SN Faculty No. %		TU Faculty No. %	
The actual achievement of teaching objectives	Very dissatisfied (VD)	10	9.4	4	5.1
	Slightly to moderately dissatisfied (SD)	48	45.3	30	38.5
	Neutral or not sure of opinion (NS)	42	39.6	33	42.3
	Slightly to moderately satisfied (SS)	6	5.7	10	12.8
	Very satisfied (VS)	0	0	1	1.3
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		78	
The immediate results from your work	VD	11	10.2	6	7.6
	SD	60	55.6	36	46.3
	NS	32	29.6	28	35.9
	SS	5	4.6	8	10.2
	VS	0	0	0	0
	Total	108		78	
The actual adoption and use of practices which you recommended	VD	4	3.7	1	1.3
	SD	39	36.1	20	26.0
	NS	49	45.4	39	50.6
	SS	11	10.2	13	16.9
	VS	5	4.6	4	5.2
	Total	108		77 <sup>b</sup>	

<sup>a</sup> Total respondents column does not add to 108 because some respondents omitted specific answers.

<sup>b</sup> Total respondents column does not add to 78 because some respondents omitted specific answers.

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
Personal goal attainment	VD	4	3.7	4	5.1
	SD	43	39.8	24	30.8
	NS	53	49.1	34	43.6
	VS	0	0	2	2.6
	Total	108		78	
Student follow practice and/or material being taught	VD	7	6.8	5	6.5
	SD	60	58.3	30	39.0
	NS	29	28.2	33	42.9
	SS	7	6.8	9	11.7
	VS	0	0	0	0
	Total	103 <sup>a</sup>		77 <sup>b</sup>	
Observing students' growth and success over a period of time	VD	3	2.9	1	1.3
	SD	29	27.6	26	33.8
	NS	64	61.0	39	50.6
	SS	8	7.6	11	14.3
	VS	1	1.0	0	0
	Total	105 <sup>a</sup>		77	
The extent to which you are able objectively to evaluate your accomplishment	VD	1	1.0	0	0
	SD	29	29.0	21	30.5
	NS	61	61.0	39	56.5
	SS	7	7.0	9	13.0
	VS	2	2.0	0	0
	Total	100 <sup>a</sup>		69 <sup>b</sup>	
2. Growth					
Opportunities for increased responsibility in education	VD	3	2.8	2	2.6
	SD	39	36.8	35	44.9
	NS	53	50.0	31	39.7

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.      %		TU Faculty No.      %	
	SS	8	7.5	6	7.7
	VS	3	2.8	4	5.1
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		78	
Opportunities provided for growth in education compared with growth in other field outside of education	VD	4	3.7	5	6.4
	SD	43	40.2	30	38.5
	NS	50	46.7	32	41.0
	SS	7	6.5	6	7.7
	VS	3	2.8	5	6.4
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		78	
Participation in in- service education	VD	6	5.7	4	5.3
	SD	37	35.2	23	30.3
	NS	45	42.9	37	48.7
	SS	11	10.5	9	11.8
	VS	6	5.7	3	3.9
	Total	105 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
Type and levels of in- service education	VD	2	1.9	3	4.1
	SD	25	24.3	20	27.4
	NS	56	54.4	36	49.3
	SS	13	12.6	11	15.1
	VS	7	6.8	3	4.1
	Total	103 <sup>a</sup>		73 <sup>b</sup>	
Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education	VD	5	4.7	6	8.0
	SD	22	20.8	17	22.7
	NS	54	50.9	40	53.3
	SS	18	17.0	4	10.7
	VS	7	6.6	4	5.3
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %	TU Faculty No.    %
Opportunities to attend professional conference, workshops, etc.	VD	8    7.4	8    10.4
	SD	50   46.3	25   32.5
	NS	33   30.6	32   41.6
	SS	10   9.3	9    11.7
	VS	7    6.5	3    3.9
	Total	108	77 <sup>b</sup>
3. Interpersonal Relations			
Friendliness of your co-workers	VD	15   13.9	12   15.4
	SD	60   55.6	35   44.9
	NS	27   25.0	27   34.6
	SS	6    5.6	3    3.8
	VS	0    0	1    1.3
	Total	108	78
Cooperation from faculty in your department	VD	14   13.0	4    5.1
	SD	58   53.7	27   34.6
	NS	27   25.0	35   44.9
	SS	9    8.3	8    10.3
	VS	0    0	4    5.1
	Total	108	78
Cooperation from faculty outside your department	VD	4    3.7	3    4.1
	SD	49   45.4	13   17.8
	NS	45   41.7	39   53.4
	SS	10   9.3	15   20.5
	VS	0    0	3    4.1
	Total	108	73 <sup>b</sup>



Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
Faculty-student relationship	VD	14	13.0	8	10.4
	SD	48	44.4	32	41.6
	NS	39	36.1	31	40.3
	SS	7	6.5	5	6.5
	VS	0	0	1	1.3
	Total	108		77 <sup>b</sup>	
Professional relationship	VD	10	9.3	8	10.4
	SD	57	52.8	34	44.2
	NS	37	34.3	28	36.4
	SS	4	3.7	6	7.8
	VS	0	0	1	1.3
	Total	108		77 <sup>b</sup>	
Personal relationship on the job	VD	22	20.4	11	14.1
	SD	57	52.8	38	48.7
	NS	26	24.1	26	33.3
	SS	3	2.8	3	3.8
	VS	0	0	0	0
	Total	108		78	
4. Policy and Administration					
Overall institutional relations including faculty, students, and staff	VD	5	4.6	2	2.6
	SD	37	34.3	13	16.9
	NS	57	52.8	48	62.3
	SS	7	6.5	12	15.6
	VS	2	1.9	2	2.6
	Total	108		77 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No. %		TU Faculty No. %	
Your involvement in making decisions	VD	6	5.6	2	2.7
	SD	22	20.4	15	20.0
	NS	52	48.1	37	49.3
	SS	21	19.4	17	22.7
	VS	7	6.5	4	5.3
	Total	108		75 <sup>b</sup>	
The procedures used to select faculty for promotion to positions such as department chairman	VD	5	4.7	1	1.3
	SD	35	32.7	11	14.1
	NS	45	42.1	33	42.3
	SS	20	18.7	23	29.5
	VS	2	1.9	10	12.8
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		78	
The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are made available to the faculty	VD	3	2.8	0	0
	SD	26	24.1	14	17.9
	NS	49	45.4	35	44.9
	SS	25	23.1	26	33.3
	VS	5	4.6	3	3.8
	Total	108		78	
The administrative procedures used to carry out the educa- tional program	VD	1	0.9	0	0
	SD	19	17.8	7	9.1
	NS	64	59.8	38	49.4
	SS	18	16.8	28	36.3
	VS	5	4.7	4	5.2
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		77 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actu- ally followed	VD	3	2.8	0	0
	SD	14	13.0	6	8.0
	NS	66	61.1	43	57.3
	SS	20	18.5	23	30.7
	VS	5	4.6	3	4.0
	Total	108		75 <sup>b</sup>	
The extent to which the policies meet faculty needs	VD	2	1.9	0	0
	SD	9	8.3	6	7.8
	NS	62	57.4	40	51.9
	SS	31	28.7	26	33.8
	VS	4	3.7	5	6.5
	Total	108		77 <sup>b</sup>	
The educational philoso- phy which prevails in your institution	VD	5	4.7	1	1.3
	SD	26	24.5	26	34.7
	NS	52	49.1	34	45.3
	SS	15	14.2	14	18.7
	VS	8	7.5	0	0
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	
5. Recognition					
Recognition of your accomplishments by co-workers	VD	5	4.6	3	3.9
	SD	45	41.7	29	37.7
	NS	53	49.1	39	50.6
	SS	5	4.6	5	6.5
	VS	0	0	1	1.3
	Total	108		77 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty		TU Faculty	
		No.	%	No.	%
Recognition of your accomplishments by superiors	VD	5	4.6	3	3.8
	SD	46	42.6	22	28.2
	NS	50	46.3	43	55.1
	SS	5	4.6	8	10.3
	VS	2	1.9	2	2.6
	Total	108		78	
Your recognition compared to that of your co-workers	VD	6	5.6	2	2.6
	SD	39	36.1	28	36.8
	NS	57	52.8	37	48.7
	SS	4	3.7	9	11.8
	VS	2	1.9	0	0
	Total	108		76 <sup>b</sup>	
The recognition you get from the adminis- tration for your ideas	VD	3	2.8	0	0
	SD	38	35.2	16	21.3
	NS	47	43.5	37	49.3
	SS	15	13.9	18	24.0
	VS	5	4.6	4	5.3
	Total	108		75 <sup>b</sup>	
Publicity given to your work and activi- ties	VD	5	4.7	3	4.1
	SD	28	26.2	15	20.3
	NS	57	53.3	36	48.6
	SS	12	11.2	19	25.7
	VS	5	4.7	1	1.4
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		78	

Table 4. (Continued)

6. Responsibility		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty NO.    %	
The authority you have to get the job done	VD	4	3.7	2	2.7
	SD	42	39.3	19	25.7
	NS	49	45.8	40	54.1
	SS	10	9.3	9	12.2
	VS	2	1.9	4	5.4
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		74 <sup>b</sup>	
The total amount of responsibility you have	VD	4	3.8	3	4.0
	SD	50	47.2	24	32.0
	NS	44	41.5	42	56.0
	SS	7	6.6	5	6.7
	VS	1	0.9	1	1.3
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	
Your responsibilities compared with those of your co-workers	VD	7	6.5	2	2.7
	SD	42	39.3	26	34.7
	NS	52	48.6	39	52.0
	SS	5	4.7	8	10.7
	VS	1	0.9	0	0
	Total	103 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	
Committee responsibility	VD	3	2.9	1	1.4
	SD	49	47.6	13	18.8
	NS	46	44.7	42	60.9
	SS	3	2.9	12	17.4
	VS	2	1.9	1	1.4
	Total	103 <sup>a</sup>		69 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
Responsibilities outside your major areas of interest	VD	4	3.8	4	5.6
	SD	38	35.8	12	16.7
	NS	53	50.0	43	59.7
	SS	9	8.5	13	18.1
	VS	2	1.9	0	0
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		72 <sup>b</sup>	
7. Salary					
The method used to determine your salary	VD	1	0.4	1	1.4
	SD	30	28.0	10	13.5
	NS	62	57.4	32	43.2
	SS	12	11.2	18	24.3
	VS	2	1.9	13	17.6
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		74 <sup>b</sup>	
The range of salaries paid to instructors in your department	VD	2	1.9	0	0
	SD	34	32.7	9	12.2
	NS	53	51.0	29	39.2
	SS	14	13.5	25	33.8
	VS	1	1.0	11	14.9
	Total	104 <sup>a</sup>		74 <sup>b</sup>	
The top salary availa- ble to instructors compared to similar positions in other fields	VD	4	3.8	2	2.6
	SD	27	25.5	7	9.1
	NS	41	38.7	18	23.4
	SS	30	28.3	31	40.3
	VS	4	3.8	19	24.7
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		77 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
Your salary compared to that of people with training in other professions	VD	2	1.9	2	2.6
	SD	35	33.0	7	9.1
	NS	31	29.2	14	18.2
	SS	32	30.2	31	40.3
	VS	6	5.7	23	29.9
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		77 <sup>b</sup>	
The amount of your salary	VD	7	6.5	0	0
	SD	34	31.8	7	9.1
	NS	44	41.1	28	36.4
	SS	19	17.8	25	32.5
	VS	3	2.8	17	22.1
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		77 <sup>b</sup>	
The earning potential of the faculty com- pared to that of the administration	VD	5	4.8	1	1.4
	SD	28	26.9	12	16.9
	NS	56	53.8	30	42.3
	SS	13	12.5	21	29.6
	VS	2	1.9	7	9.9
	Total	104 <sup>a</sup>		71 <sup>b</sup>	
8. Supervision					
The level of under- standing that your supervisors and you have of each other	VD	7	6.5	1	1.3
	SD	43	40.2	21	27.6
	NS	48	44.9	39	51.3
	SS	8	7.5	12	15.8
	VS	1	0.9	3	3.9
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
On-the-job supervision given by your supervisor	VD	6	5.6	1	1.3
	SD	40	37.4	15	19.7
	NS	39	36.4	43	56.6
	SS	19	17.8	13	17.1
	VS	3	2.8	4	5.3
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
Competence of your supervisor to give leadership	VD	5	4.7	2	2.7
	SD	38	35.8	9	12.0
	NS	38	35.8	42	56.0
	SS	21	19.8	14	18.7
	VS	4	3.8	8	10.7
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	
Personal encouragement given by your supervisor	VD	11	10.3	2	2.6
	SD	32	29.9	11	14.5
	NS	47	43.9	37	48.7
	SS	14	13.1	17	22.4
	VS	3	2.8	9	11.8
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
The willingness of your superior to delegate authority	VD	10	9.3	2	2.6
	SD	22	20.6	15	19.7
	NS	46	43.0	30	39.5
	SS	20	18.7	20	26.3
	VS	9	8.4	9	11.8
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	



Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
Authority delegated compared to duties delegated	VD	5	4.8	0	0
	SD	28	26.9	19	25.3
	NS	57	54.8	40	53.3
	SS	13	12.5	12	16.0
	VS	1	1.0	4	5.3
	Total	104 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	
Counsel and guidance given by your super- visors	VD	5	4.7	2	2.7
	SD	33	31.1	12	16.0
	NS	52	49.1	36	48.0
	SS	10	9.4	16	21.3
	VS	6	5.7	9	12.0
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	
The initiation of innovations by your supervisors	VD	7	6.6	1	1.4
	SD	33	31.1	12	16.2
	NS	38	35.8	34	45.9
	SS	20	18.9	17	25.0
	VS	8	7.5	10	13.5
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		74 <sup>b</sup>	
The fairness of your supervisors	VD	8	7.5	3	3.9
	SD	33	30.8	15	19.7
	NS	46	43.0	32	42.1
	SS	12	11.2	16	21.1
	VS	8	7.5	10	13.2
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
The sensitivity of your superiors to your needs	VD	10	9.4	2	2.6
	SD	34	32.1	9	11.8
	NS	39	36.8	39	51.3
	SS	18	17.0	16	21.1
	VS	5	4.7	10	13.2
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
The consistency of your supervisors	VD	9	8.5	2	2.6
	SD	32	30.2	13	17.1
	NS	44	41.5	34	44.7
	SS	17	16.0	20	26.3
	VS	4	3.8	7	9.2
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
Specific on-the-job training offered by your superior	VD	3	2.9	1	1.4
	SD	21	20.0	9	12.5
	NS	45	42.9	28	38.9
	SS	28	26.7	25	34.7
	VS	8	7.6	9	12.5
	Total	105 <sup>a</sup>		72 <sup>b</sup>	
9. The Work Itself					
Work and association with college-age student	VD	4	3.7	2	2.6
	SD	29	27.1	18	23.7
	NS	58	54.2	40	52.6
	SS	15	14.0	14	18.4
	VS	1	0.9	2	2.6
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
The interesting and challenging aspects of teaching	VD	10	9.8	7	9.1
	SD	45	44.1	34	44.2
	NS	39	38.2	26	33.8
	SS	6	5.9	10	13.0
	VS	2	2.0	0	0
	Total	102 <sup>a</sup>		77 <sup>b</sup>	
The general type of work you do	VD	6	5.6	2	2.6
	SD	42	39.3	23	30.3
	NS	54	50.5	45	59.2
	SS	5	4.7	6	7.9
	VS	0	0	0	0
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
Your level of enthusiasm about teaching	VD	6	5.7	6	7.9
	SD	61	57.5	33	43.4
	NS	35	33.0	33	43.4
	SS	4	3.8	4	5.3
	VS	0	0	0	0
	Total	106 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
10. Working Conditions					
The number of classes or groups for which you are responsible	VD	4	3.9	4	5.3
	SD	51	49.5	30	39.5
	NS	35	34.0	32	42.1
	SS	13	12.6	9	11.8
	VS	0	0	1	1.3
	Total	103 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
The number of hours you work each week	VD	6	5.7	5	6.5
	SD	48	45.7	27	35.1
	NS	39	37.1	40	51.9
	SS	12	11.4	5	6.5
	VS	0	0	0	0
	Total	105 <sup>a</sup>		77 <sup>b</sup>	
your work schedule compared to that of similar positions in other fields	VD	6	5.8	3	4.2
	SD	42	40.8	27	37.5
	NS	40	38.8	34	47.2
	SS	15	14.6	8	11.1
	VS	0	0	0	0
	Total	103 <sup>a</sup>		72 <sup>b</sup>	
Your office facilities	VD	7	6.5	2	2.6
	SD	28	26.2	16	21.1
	NS	34	31.8	33	43.4
	SS	31	29.0	23	30.3
	VS	7	6.5	2	2.6
	Total	107 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	
The adequacy of instructional equipment	VD	4	3.8	0	0
	SD	22	21.2	12	15.8
	NS	41	39.4	33	43.4
	SS	29	27.9	27	35.5
	VS	8	7.7	4	5.3
	Total	104 <sup>a</sup>		76 <sup>b</sup>	

Table 4. (Continued)

		SN Faculty No.    %		TU Faculty No.    %	
The number of course preparations required	VD	5	4.8	3	4.0
	SD	36	34.6	22	29.3
	NS	50	48.1	39	52.0
	SS	9	8.7	10	13.3
	VS	4	3.8	1	1.3
	Total	104 <sup>a</sup>		75 <sup>b</sup>	
Your work schedule compared to that of your co-workers	VD	4	4.0	3	4.2
	SD	41	40.6	20	28.2
	NS	44	43.6	38	53.5
	SS	10	9.9	8	11.3
	VS	2	2.0	2	2.8
	Total	101 <sup>a</sup>		71 <sup>b</sup>	
11. Overall job satisfaction					
Consider all aspects of your job as an instruc- tor and indicate your overall level of job satisfaction or dissat- isfaction	VD	3	3.4	1	1.4
	SD	39	43.8	22	31.9
	NS	37	41.6	34	49.3
	SS	9	10.1	9	13.0
	VS	1	1.1	3	4.3
	Total	89 <sup>a</sup>		69 <sup>b</sup>	

Each of the ten "motivator" and "hygiene" factors is examined as follows:

1. Achievement. Faculty members of the two institutions responded negatively to all the items relative to achievement. A minority of faculty members indicated satisfaction given them in the area of "The actual adoption of practices which you recommend". Although a majority of respondents indicated "neutral" or "not sure of opinion", the dissatisfied responses outnumbered satisfied responses. This results in a lack of job satisfaction among the faculty members relative to the factors of achievement. It is also noted that no significant difference was found between the two groups.

2. Growth. The dissatisfied responses again outnumbered satisfied responses in all items related to the factor of growth. No significant difference was found between the two groups of faculty members. The dissatisfaction expressed by the faculty members manifests itself as a lack of job satisfaction.

3. Interpersonal Relations. Significant differences were found between the two groups of faculty members in the areas of "Cooperation from faculty in your department" and "Cooperation from faculty outside your department". A number of negative responses expressed by SN faculty members were relatively higher than those of TU faculty.

TU faculty members gave quite positive responses in the area of "Cooperation from faculty outside your department". With the exception of this area, dissatisfied responses expressed by both groups outnumbered satisfied responses. Thus, the data indicate a lack of job satisfaction among faculty members regarding the interpersonal relations.

4. Policy and Administration. Some significant differences were also noted between these two groups relative to the areas of "Overall institutional relations including faculty, students, and staff", "the procedures used to select faculty for promotion to positions such as department chairman", and "the administrative procedures used to carry out the educational program". TU faculty members responded very positively to these three items in comparison with SN faculty members. Because the responses to these items of the two groups were largely positive, a degree of job satisfaction among faculty members is indicated in this area.

5. Recognition. The responses to these items were largely negative; thus, the faculty members dissatisfied in the area of recognition.

6. Responsibility. No significant difference was found between the two groups. The dissatisfied responses outnumbered satisfied responses in all items relative to the responsibility factors. Thus, the data indicate a lack

of job satisfaction among faculty members in the area of responsibility.

7. Salary. Some significant differences were disclosed between the two groups of faculty members. In examining responses, TU faculty members responded very positively to all the items related to salary in comparison with SN faculty members. This indicates a higher degree of job satisfaction among TU faculty members in this area. As for SN faculty members, they responded positively to the items related to salary except in the areas of "the method used to determine your salary", and "The earning potential of the faculty compared to that of the administrators". This results in a lack of job satisfaction among that portion of the SN faculty members. However, as a whole, both groups respond positively to the area of salary.

8. Supervision. Some significant differences were found between the two groups of faculty members. Whereas TU faculty members responded positively to most of the items relating to supervision, SN faculty members responded negatively to most of the items in this area. As shown in Table 4, supervision tends to cause job satisfaction among TU faculty members, but job dissatisfaction among SN faculty members.

9. The Work Itself. No significant differences were noted between the two groups. Because the responses to



the items on the work itself were all highly negative, a great deal to job dissatisfaction with the type of work performed by both groups of faculty members is indicated in the data.

10. Working Conditions. There were significant amounts of dissatisfied responses by both groups to these items indicating a lack of job satisfaction caused by the factor of working conditions. Both groups are dissatisfied with their work facilities or work area.

11. Overall Job Satisfaction. The vast majority of both groups indicate they are quite dissatisfied with their job at the current institution. However, such evidence will be examined in more detail by considering a number of independent variables included in this study.

#### Comparisons of the Findings with the Two-factor Theory

In comparisons of the Herzberg Two-factor Theory and the result of this study, Table 5 summarizes the overall mean and standard deviation of each major factor. It should be pointed out that the questionnaire regarding the factors was different from that of the Herzberg incident study.

Unexpectedly, most of the mean responses to each major factor fell somewhere between the "2" and "3". The value of "2" was assigned to responses: slightly to moderately dissatisfied" and a value of "3" to the response "neutral or not sure of opinion". The value of "4" was

Table 5. Summary of overall mean and standard deviation of each major factor

Factors	Mean <sup>a</sup>	Standard deviation
Achievement	2.638	0.490
Growth	2.775	0.689
Interpersonal relationship/supervisors/colleagues/students	2.408	0.617
Policy and administration	3.074	0.559
Recognition	2.747	0.622
Responsibility	2.686	0.562
Salary	3.178	0.784
Supervision	2.983	0.785
Work itself	2.592	0.579
Working conditions	2.435	0.556

<sup>a</sup>Mean values are based upon the following: 1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = slightly to moderately dissatisfied; 3 = neutral or not sure of opinion; 4 = slightly to moderately satisfied; and 5 = very satisfied.

given to the response: slightly to moderately satisfied. For the total group (N = 186), overall mean scores were slightly high or above "3" on salary, policy and administration. Such scores were low or below "3" on the factor of achievement, growth, interpersonal relations, recognition, supervision, responsibility, work itself, and working conditions. These results suggest that the extrinsic or hygiene factors of satisfaction are of value to Thai faculty members. The ranking of the means indicates some extrinsic or hygiene factors such as salary, policy and administration have contributed to job satisfaction, whereas the intrinsic or motivator factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself contributed to dissatisfaction. It should be pointed out that supervision, a hygiene factor, appears to be related to the satisfaction.

Since many of the values fell in the neutral area, it may be appropriate to suggest that the meaning of neutrality in the measurement of satisfaction and dissatisfaction supports in part the Herzberg Two-factor Theory.

In summary, since the mean neutral value is 3.00, the figures shown in Table 5 appear to indicate that Thai faculty members were more dissatisfied than satisfied with a number of factors relating to their work roles.

### Test of the Hypotheses

#### Hypothesis I:

There are no significant differences among faculty members of different age levels regarding factors measuring their job satisfaction.

A one way analysis of variance and Scheffé test were used to measure the significance of the different age levels of faculty members' responses to each major factor. Table 6 represents the means and standard deviations of all age levels and F statistic for each major factor.

An examination of Table 6 indicates a highly significant statistical difference in the responses to the salary factor. In addition, an analysis by means of Scheffé method also reveals a significant difference ( $p = .05$ ) in satisfaction with salary between Group 5 (41 and over) and Group 2 (26-30) and Group 3 (31-35).

Based on the mean differences, Group 5 (41 and over) tends to be less satisfied with the salary factor than the other age level groups. The null hypothesis is then rejected for this factor.

Because no significant differences are noted in the faculty members' responses for the other major factors, the null hypothesis is not rejected for other major factors.

Table 6. The means of major factors measuring job satisfaction  
for five age groups

Major factors	25 or less	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-Over	F statistic
Achievement	2.3810	2.7309	2.6539	2.6309	2.6294	0.790
Growth	2.6667	2.7600	2.6841	2.7437	2.8750	0.591
Interpersonal relations	2.3542	2.5295	2.4984	2.4037	2.3103	0.900
Policy and administration	3.1250	3.2650	3.1027	3.0281	3.0063	1.092
Recognition	2.6750	2.9200	2.7000	2.7182	2.7385	0.591
Responsibility	2.5250	2.8520	2.6287	2.7568	2.6246	1.177
Salary	3.5417	3.5067	3.3378	3.2697	2.8375	5.648**
Supervision	2.9687	3.1717	2.9748	3.0407	2.8784	0.689
Work Itself	2.3438	2.6567	2.5278	2.6204	2.6211	0.637
Working conditions	2.2656	2.5826	2.5321	2.4389	2.3332	0.1470
Overall job satisfaction	2.5000	2.8182	2.7895	2.7150	2.6852	0.289

\*\* Significant at .01 level.

Hypothesis II.

There is no significant difference between male and female faculty members regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.

The results of the data analysis of this hypothesis are found in Table 7. A t-test was run on the mean differences between male and female faculty members' responses for each of the ten factors. The t-formula for pooled variance was used.

An examination of this table indicates no significant statistical differences reported between male and female faculty members regarding the major factors affecting their job satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Hypothesis III:

There is no significant difference between married and unmarried faculty members regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.

A t-test was run on the mean differences between married and unmarried faculty members responses for each of the major factors.

A significant statistical difference between married and unmarried faculty members was found in the working conditions. As the table shows, the mean of married (2.3701) was lower than that for unmarried (2.5406). Based on the mean differences, married faculty members were more dissatisfied with working conditions than their unmarried counter-

Table 7. Comparison of male and female faculty members regarding factors measuring their job satisfaction

Major factors	Group	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
				Pooled t-value	Probability
Achievement	Male	2.6286	0.478	-0.31	0.758
	Female	2.6511	0.504		
Growth	Male	2.6977	0.639	-1.49	0.139
	Female	2.8490	0.728		
Interpersonal relations	Male	2.4226	0.612	0.35	0.725
	Female	2.3905	0.626		
Policy and administration	Male	3.0082	0.566	-1.51	0.132
	Female	3.1330	0.551		
Recognition	Male	2.6698	0.572	-1.61	0.110
	Female	2.8177	0.661		
Responsibility	Male	2.6382	0.516	-1.14	0.255
	Female	2.7348	0.600		
Salary	Male	3.1405	0.798	-0.57	0.567
	Female	3.2077	0.778		
Supervision	Male	2.9067	0.727	-1.19	0.237
	Female	3.0448	0.833		
Work itself	Male	2.5601	0.549	-0.72	0.473
	Female	2.6220	0.609		
Working conditions	Male	2.3755	0.503	-1.45	0.490
	Female	2.3755	0.598		
Overall job satisfaction	Male	2.6575	0.768	-1.03	0.305
	Female	2.7882	0.818		

Table 8. Comparison of married and unmarried faculty members regarding factors measuring their job satisfaction

Major factors	Group	Mean	Standard	Variance	
				Pooled t-value	Probability
Achievement	Married	2.6093	0.487	-1.04	0.298
	Unmarried	2.6871	0.495		
Growth	Married	2.7032	0.670	-1.78	0.076
	Unmarried	2.8883	0.707		
Interpersonal relations	Married	2.3930	0.600	-0.42	0.677
	Unmarried	2.4319	0.647		
Policy and administration	Married	3.0227	0.586	-1.58	0.116
	Unmarried	3.1554	0.504		
Recognition	Married	2.6952	0.580	-1.45	0.148
	Unmarried	2.8326	0.681		
Responsibility	Married	2.6527	0.545	-1.01	0.315
	Unmarried	2.7403	0.589		
Salary	Married	3.0933	0.782	-1.85	0.067
	Unmarried	3.3124	0.774		
Supervision	Married	2.9453	0.822	-0.81	0.418
	Unmarried	3.0421	0.086		
Work itself	Married	2.5767	0.534	-0.46	0.644
	Unmarried	2.6174	0.647		
Working conditions	Married	2.3701	0.537	-2.02	0.045*
	Unmarried	2.5406	0.575		
Overall job satisfaction	Married	2.6122	0.782	-1.37	0.139

\* Significant at .05 level.



parts. The null hypothesis is rejected for this factor.

Because no significant statistical difference is noted between married and unmarried faculty members' responses to other factors, the null hypothesis is not rejected for the other factors of the study.

Hypothesis IV:

There are no significant differences among faculty members with different number of years of service regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.

An analysis of variance and the Scheffé test were employed for testing of this hypothesis. Table 9 represents the means of all groups of years employed and the F statistic for each major factor.

Again, there is only a significant statistical difference in the faculty members' responses to the salary factor. Results of the Scheffé method also support similar significant difference ( $p = .05$ ) in satisfaction with salary between Group 4 (11 years and over) and other age groups.

Inspection of Table 9 indicates that Group 4 (11 years and over) has the lower mean and is thus less satisfied with salary factor than other groups. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected for this factor. As for the rest of the factors, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 9. The means of major factors measuring faculty job satisfaction for four groups on the number of years employed

Major factors	Less than 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11 years or higher	F statistic
Achievement	2.5890	2.5945	2.6877	2.6293	0.342
Growth	2.7833	2.6272	2.8228	2.8092	0.740
Interpersonal relations	2.3479	2.2982	2.5378	2.3636	1.433
Policy and administration	3.0625	3.1123	3.1405	3.0038	0.747
Recognition	2.4444	2.7053	2.8700	2.7066	1.676
Responsibility	2.8056	2.6553	2.7991	2.5966	1.592
Salary	3.9000	3.1798	3.3060	2.9789	5.320*
Supervision	2.9538	3.0456	3.0827	2.8778	0.857
Work itself	2.5417	2.5658	2.6014	2.6053	0.069
Working conditions	2.5258	2.5103	2.4582	2.3680	0.706
Overall job satisfaction	3.0000	2.6364	2.8000	2.6866	0.651

\* Significant at .05 level.

Hypothesis V:

There are no significant differences among faculty members with different levels of formal education regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.

A one way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test were used in the testing of this hypothesis. Table 10 shows the mean of each highest level of formal education group and the F statistic of each major factor.

Inspection of Table 10 reveals a highly significant difference in salary factor among the groups having different level of formal education. Results of the Scheffé method also support similar significant difference between Group 2 (Master's degree) and Group 3 (Doctoral degree). Group 2 has the lower mean and is thus less satisfied with the salary factor than the other groups. The null hypothesis for this factor is rejected.

Because no significant differences are produced for the other major factors, the null hypothesis is not rejected for those factors.

Hypothesis VI:

There is no significant difference between faculty members engaged in teaching and research, and faculty members engaged in academic administration regarding the factors affecting their job satisfaction.

A one way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test were employed for testing this hypothesis. Table 11 gives the means and standard deviations of each group of assigned

Table 10. The means of major factors measuring faculty job satisfaction for three educational level groups

Major factors	Bachelor's degree	Master's degree	Doctoral degree	F statistic
Achievement	2.6088	2.6510	2.6585	0.058
Growth	2.9457	2.7705	2.6667	0.822
Interpersonal relations	2.3214	2.4120	2.4141	0.244
Policy and administration	3.0051	3.0936	3.0750	0.191
Recognition	2.6554	2.8176	2.5920	1.340
Responsibility	2.6296	2.7196	2.6740	0.214
Salary	3.1440	2.0766	3.6267	4.201**
Supervision	2.8793	2.9852	3.0600	0.238
Work itself	2.6518	2.5751	2.5967	0.142
Working conditions	2.3743	2.4478	2.3891	1.094
Overall job satisfaction	2.7143	2.7222	2.7143	0.565

\*\* Significant at .01 level.

Table 11. The means of major factors measuring faculty job satisfaction for five groups on the basis of primary responsibility

Major factors	Teaching	Research	Teaching and Research	Adminis- tration	Teaching and Administration	F statistic
Achievement	2.6190	2.3333	2.6470	2.9464	2.5994	1.206
Growth	2.8593	2.7083	2.7877	2.8370	2.5963	1.054
Interpersonal relations	2.3456	2.7667	2.4937	2.5370	2.3333	1.055
Policy and ad- ministration	3.1431	3.0625	3.0622	3.1667	2.9611	0.792
Recognition	2.8634	2.6000	2.6930	2.6889	2.6567	1.005
Responsibility	2.7785	2.6125	2.6625	2.9750	2.5204	2.010
Salary	3.0793	3.7083	3.2887	3.2963	3.1177	1.114
Supervision	3.0667	3.0000	3.0328	2.9882	2.7899	0.939
Work itself	2.5112	3.1667	2.6491	2.7593	2.5489	1.723
Working condi- tions	2.3705	2.2917	2.5387	2.5625	2.3657	1.059
Overall job satisfaction	2.7241	3.0000	2.8163	3.1429	2.5122	1.469

responsibility and the F statistic for each factor.

An examination of Table 11 indicates no significant differences in the responses of each group regarding factors affecting their job satisfaction. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Hypothesis VII:

There are no significant differences among faculty members of different academic ranks regarding the factors measuring their job satisfaction.

A one way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test were employed to measure the significance of four groups of faculty members with different academic ranks regarding the factors affecting their job satisfaction. Table 12 presents the mean of each group of academic rank and the F statistic for each major factor. An examination of Table 12 discloses the following:

1. A significant statistical difference among the groups with different academic ranks is found in the recognition factor. An F-value of 3.007 ( $p < 0.032$ ) is recorded. Group 3 (associate professors) has the lower mean and is thus more dissatisfied with recognition than other groups.

2. A highly significant statistical difference among the groups is found in the salary factor. This factor has an F-value of 6.097 ( $p < 0.0006$ ). The Scheffé method also reveals a significant difference ( $p = .05$ ) in satisfaction with salary between Group 3 (associate professors) and

Table 12. The means of major factors measuring faculty jobs satisfaction for four groups on the basis of academic ranks

Major factors	Instructors	Assistant professors	Associate professors	Professors	F statistic
Achievement	2.6919	2.6374	2.3009	2.2857	2.264
Growth	2.7455	2.7844	2.8000	2.6667	0.059
Interpersonal relation	2.4704	2.3687	2.1515	2.3333	1.025
Policy and administration	3.1118	3.0878	2.6705	2.8750	2.110
Recognition	2.8115	2.7683	2.2727	2.6500	3.007*
Responsibility	2.7139	2.7333	2.2591	2.4000	2.478
Salary	3.3236	3.1453	2.3182	2.5000	6.097**
Supervision	2.9681	3.0682	2.4545	2.6677	2.042
Work itself	2.6146	2.5918	2.3106	2.7500	0.925
Working conditions	2.5354	2.3922	2.0455	2.3750	2.961*
Overall job satisfaction	2.8312	2.7353	2.5000	3.0015	2.151

\* Significant at .05 level.

\*\* Significant at .05 level.

Group 2 (assistant professors), and between Group 3 (associate professors) and Group 1 (instructors). Inspection of Table 12 shows that lowest level of satisfaction with the salary factor is reported by Group 3 (associate professors).

3. A significant statistical difference among the groups is also found in working conditions. An F-value of 2.961 ( $p < 0.03$ ) is recorded. Again, Group 3 (associate professors) has the lower mean and is thus more dissatisfaction with working conditions than the other groups.

Although the Scheffé method does not substantiate the result of the one way analysis of variance on recognition and working conditions, the null hypothesis is rejected for recognition, salary, and working conditions but not for the rest of the major factors.



## CHAPTER V.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The final chapter of this study includes (1) a summarization of the findings in Chapter IV, (2) conclusions and implications, and (3) recommendations for further study.

Summary

The purposes of this study were to identify factors measuring job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of Thai faculty members at two selected universities in Thailand. The study drew ten major factors corresponding to job satisfaction in the Herzberg Two-factor Theory to determine whether or not such selected factors are related to job satisfaction of Thai faculty members.

The study sought answers to the following questions:

- (1) Do the selected factors measure job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of Thai faculty members?;
- (2) What are the characteristics of the most satisfied and the least satisfied groups?;
- (3) Are Thai faculty members in significant agreement on the factors that measure their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction?;
- (4) Is the pattern of job attitudes of Thai faculty members similar to the pattern found in the Herzberg model?;
- (5) Do the ten factors selected from the Herzberg Two-factor Theory seem to be adaptable to the measurement of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of teaching staff in higher education institutions in Thailand?

Questionnaires were sent to 300 faculty members of two selected universities in Thailand. A useable return of 186 or 62.0% was obtained.

The data obtained were analyzed to differentiate between the two groups of faculty members relative to the rating factors. All null hypotheses were tested using a t-test, an analysis of variance, and the Scheffé test.

The findings of this study may be summarized as follows:

1. The major sources of job satisfaction for Thai faculty members were policy and administration, and salary. The relevant sources of dissatisfaction were achievement, growth, interpersonal relations, recognition, responsibility, supervision, work itself, and working conditions.

2. Among the major sources of job satisfaction, age, number of years employed, formal education level, and academic rank of faculty members were affected by salary. The findings disclosed that the 41 and over age groups were least satisfied with salary than other groups. Those who were in associate professor rank as well as those who have been employed for 11 years and over were the groups found to be least satisfied with salary. However, when formal education levels were considered, those with a doctoral degree were found more satisfied with salary factor compared with other groups of different formal education levels.

3. Among the major sources of job dissatisfaction, marital status and academic rank of faculty members were affected by working conditions and recognition. Married faculty members were more significantly dissatisfied with working conditions than the unmarried co-workers. Also, associate professors were found to be significantly more dissatisfied with working conditions and recognition than the other groups of faculty members with different academic ranks.

4. Sex and the primary responsibility of faculty members were found to have no significant differences regarding the major factor measuring faculty job satisfaction.

5. In comparison with the Herzberg Two-factor Theory, the motivator or intrinsic factors contributed more to dissatisfaction than satisfaction of faculty members. Conversely, it was found that two hygies, salary, and policy and administration, acted as significant contributors to the satisfaction of faculty members in this study. However, since the values of rating factors fell in the neutral area, it may be appropriate to conclude that the meaning of neutrality in the measurement of satisfaction and dissatisfaction supported in part the Herzberg Two-factor theory.

6. Because the job satisfaction of Thai faculty members in this study was reflected by the presence of some

hygiene factors while job dissatisfaction was reflected by the absence of motivators, the ten factors selected from the Herzberg Two-factor Theory for use in the assessment instrument may not be adaptable to the measurement of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of teaching staff in the two selected Thai universities. Some deviations from the two-factor theory could be due to cultural and/or occupational differences between professor Herzberg's population and the population in this study.

#### Conclusions and Implications

The findings reported on the factors measuring faculty job satisfaction of this sample of faculty members are in partial support of the Herzberg Two-factor Theory. This study shows that all motivator factors are related to job dissatisfaction; while some of the hygiene factors do lead to job satisfaction. These "motivators" in Herzberg's words including advancement, recognition, responsibility, achievement, and the work itself attained low value for Thai faculty members, showing a trend in the direction of job dissatisfaction. Two "hygiene" factors, policy and administration, and salary were low in Herzberg's model, but appeared high for Thai faculty members, disclosing a trend in the direction of job satisfaction. This study suggests that cultural background differences may have an impact on employees reaction to job satisfaction. On the other hand, the pattern of job attitudes for Thai faculty

members is not similar to that in the Herzberg job satisfaction model. The results of this study tend to support the traditional pattern of job satisfaction.

This study has a number of practical implications for the institutional administrators. If the educational institutions in Thailand have no instrument designed to measure faculty perceptions, the administrators may elect to use the same instrument to investigate the areas of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. However, some changes in the instrument may be made to meet the local needs. As for the administrators of the two selected institutions in this study, a follow-up study to determine whether faculty attitudes change should be made at least annually in each institution.

Since findings reveal that all motivator or intrinsic factors are strongly related to job dissatisfaction, concerted efforts should be made to improve job satisfaction in each of the motivator or intrinsic factors. Jobs should be enriched and emphasis should be placed on motivator or intrinsic areas to lead faculty toward self-actualization and satisfaction. Improvement in areas rated low would lead to improvement in education. If motivator or intrinsic factors could be improved to provide more flexibility and more adaptability to changing conditions; if interpersonal relations are improved so as to facilitate better

teaching; and if working conditions are improved, quality of education would most certainly have to increase along with faculty satisfaction. Further, it may be beneficial to the institution in terms of the selection and recruitment process. An institution's ability to attract and retain able faculty members may well depend upon the degree of satisfaction the institution provides its faculty. The recruitment and selection function may be enhanced if a high level of job satisfaction is maintained.

In summary, this study hopefully provided the means to perceive factors that measure Thai faculty members. It is recommended that each selected institution utilize the results from this study to improve the job satisfaction of each individual faculty member according to his or her indicated needs. In addition, the disclosing factors that affect faculty job satisfaction should be documented to assist with general and long-range plans for improvement.

### Limitations

As stated in Chapter I, the conclusions of this study cannot be generalized to all faculty members across Thailand. The results are restricted to the two universities from which the sample was drawn.

### Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are made for further study of factors measuring Thai faculty job satisfaction:

1. The present study might be replicated by using the critical incident method employed by Professor Herzberg as a parallel verification study for the structured questionnaire.

2. The replication of the study on factors measuring Thai faculty job satisfaction with larger sample groups coverings all universities in the country is needed to substantiate the effects of both significant and non-significant factors in the present study. The problem areas could be further investigated, the findings of which might possibly indicate what could be done to increase faculty job satisfaction in the institutions of higher learning in Thailand.

3. Because the instrument is based heavily on the motivator and hygiene factors in the Herzberg Two-factor Theory, it is recommended that more attempts need to be made in developing a standardized research instrument to measure factors related to job satisfaction in Thailand. With the development of such an instrument, research of the cooperative type could be undertaken. These may be

some of the challenges and the needs which lie ahead for job satisfaction researchers.



## REFERENCES

- Allen, George R. Sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. *Banking*, 1967, 6, 64-70.
- Arayasart, Pranee. Job satisfaction of educational administrators at school and college levels under the Department of Vocational Education. Unpublished master's thesis. Library, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, 1975.
- Avakian, A. N. An analysis of factors relating to the job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of faculty members in institutions of higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, 32(3-A), 1765.
- Becvar, Raphael J. Job satisfaction of first-year teachers: A study of discrepancies between expectations and experiences. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1970, 30(9-A), 4298.
- Behling, Orlando, Labovitz, George, and Kosmo, Richard. The Herzberg controversy: A critical reappraisal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1968, 11, 99-108.
- Blai, Boris, Jr. A job satisfaction predictor. *Personnel Journal*, 1963, 42, 453-456.
- Bloom, Robert, and Barry, John R. Determinants of work attitudes among negroes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1967, 51(3), 291-294.
- Caplow, Theodore, and McGee, Reece T. *The academic marketplace*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964.
- Chancharoen, Pratan. Morale of instructors in teacher colleges. Unpublished master's thesis. Library Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, 1976.
- Chatatrakul, Nakorn. A comparative study of morale between teachers in Bangkok and those in Northeastern Region of Thailand. Unpublished master's thesis. Library, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, 1972.
- Cohen, A. M. Community college faculty job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 1974, 2, 369-376.

- Cummings, L. L., and ElSalmi, A. M. Empirical research on the bases and correlates of managerial motivation: A review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1968, 70, 127-144.
- Dufty, N. F. Blue collar contrast. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 1967, 8, 209-217.
- Dunnette, Marvin D., Campbell, John P., and Hekel, Milton D. Factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in six occupational groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1967, 2(2), 143-174.
- England, George W., and Stein, Carroll I. The occupational reference group - a neglected concept in employee attitude studies. In Michael M. Gruneberg (ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Ewen, Robert B. Some determinants of job satisfaction: A study of the generality of Herzberg's theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1964, 48, 161-163.
- Ewen, Robert B., Smith, Patricia C., Hulin, Charles L., and Locke, Edwin. An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1966, 6, 544-550.
- Feuille, P., and Blandin, J. Faculty job satisfaction and bargaining sentiments: A case study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1974, 7, 678-692.
- Field, George R. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction of University of Wisconsin faculty members by campus location. *Dissertation Abstract*, 1966, 26(7-8), 3715.
- Field, Hubert S., and Giles, William F. Dimensions of faculty members' sensitivity to job satisfaction items. *Research in Higher Education*, 1977, 6, 193-199.
- Garrison, R. Junior college faculty issues and problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior College, 1967.
- Hafen, Brent Q. Job satisfaction among health educators. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, 31(7-A), 3776.

- Hall, D. T., and Nougaim, K. E. An examination of Maslow's need hierarchy in an organization setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 1968, 3, 12-35.
- Hammer, Robert E. Job satisfaction of special class teachers in Iowa: An application of the Herzberg's two-factor theory. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, 31(7-A), 3373.
- Herzberg, Frederick, Mausner, Bernard, and Synderman, Blooh S. *The motivation to work* (2nd Ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.
- Herzberg, F., Peterson, R., and Capwell, D. *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Hodgetts, R. M. *Management: Theory, process and practice*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1975.
- Hollon, C. J., and Gremmill, G. R. A comparison of female and male professors on participation in decision making, job related tension, job involvement, and job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1976, 12, 80-93.
- House, Robert J., and Wigdor, Lawrence A. Herzberg's dual factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology*, 1967, 20, 369-380.
- Hulin, Charles L., and Smith, Patricia C. A linear model of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1965, 49, 209-216.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An empirical investigation of two implications of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1967, 51, 396-402.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sex differences in Job Satisfaction. In Michael M. Gruneberg (ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Hutchison, Charles W. Measuring job satisfaction of classified school employees. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, 32(7-A), 4289.
- Kapilakanchana, Nuntana, Nilwatchala, Supatra, Suratanakawikun, Phuangphet, and Sophon, Buncherd. Incentive in working of Kasetsart University instructors. Bangkok, Thailand: Kasetsart University, 1978.

- Kennecke, Larry J. Major factors and specific aspects affecting the job satisfactions and dissatisfactions of Oregon industrial education teachers. Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 29(7-A), 2039.
- King, Nathan. Classification and evaluation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. In Michael M. Gruneberg (ed.), Job Satisfaction. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Klein, S. M., and Maher, J. R. Education level and satisfaction with pay. In Michael M. Gruneberg (ed.), Job Satisfaction. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Kuhlen, Raymond G. Needs, perceived need satisfaction opportunities, and satisfaction with occupation. In Michael M. Gruneberg (ed.), Job Satisfaction. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Kurt, E. L., and Mills, E. R. Analysis of degree of faculty satisfaction in Florida community junior colleges: A final report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1968.
- Lacy, Annel. An analysis of factors that affect job satisfaction of public high school business teachers in Ohio. Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 30(1-A), 67.
- Lahiri, Dilip K., and Srivastva, Suresh. Determinants of satisfaction in middle-management personnel. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51(3), 254-265.
- Lee, Richard H. The relationship between selected life history antecedent and the job satisfaction of school principals. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(A-3), 929.
- Leon, Julio S. An investigation of the applicability of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction among college and university professors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(A-9), 5397.
- Lindsay, Carl A., Marks, Edmond, and Gorlow, Leon. The Herzberg theory: a critique and reformulation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51(4), 330-339.
- Locke, E. The nature and consequences of job satisfaction. In Marvin D. Dunnette (ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

- Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and personality (2nd Ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Merrill, Peter P. A study concerning the job satisfaction of elementary teachers and principals. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31(A-3), 1547.
- Myers, Scott M. Who are your motivated workers? Harvard Business Review, 1964, 42(1), 73-80.
- Neumann, Yoram. Predicting faculty job satisfaction in university departments. Research in Higher Education, 1978, 9, 261-275.
- Nicholson, Edward A., and Miljus, Robert C. Job satisfaction and turnover among liberal arts college professors. Personnel Journal, 1972, 51, 840-845.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- O'Reilly, C. A., and Roberts, K. H. Individual differences in personality, position in the organization and job satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 14, 144-150.
- Panmuk, Suwat. Some factors in motivating agriculture teachers to job satisfaction in the secondary schools under the General Education Department of Thailand. Unpublished master's thesis. Library, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, 1975.
- Parker, Thomas M. The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35(4-A), 1972.
- Pasuwan, Charoong. Adaptability of the Herzberg job satisfaction model to vocational education personnel in Thailand. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(11-A), 6251.
- Perry, J. L. The inter-relationship of job satisfaction and similarity in philosophic view within academic departments. Research in Higher Education, 1977, 7, 269-280.

- Petput, Niyom. A study of morale of the university personnel: A case study of Kasetsart University. Unpublished master's thesis. Libray, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, 1971.
- Porter, Lyman W. Job attitudes in management: II. Perceived importance of needs as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1963, 47(2), 141-148.
- Prien, Erich P., Barrett, Gerald V., and Svetlik, Byron. The prediction of job performance. *Personnel Administration*, 1967, 30(2), 40-43.
- Probe, Gerald B. An investigation of the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and selected personnel characteristics. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, 31(9-A), 5093.
- Rada, Alexander. A study of factors influencing job satisfactions of community college teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, 36(6-A), 3455.
- Robbins, Wayne L. Perceived job satisfiers and dissatisfiers among professors of educational administration. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, 36(A-6), 3456.
- Robinson, Alan H., Connors, Ralph P., and Holly, G. Whitacre. Job satisfaction researches of 1964-1965. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1966, 45(4), 371-379.
- Rollins, T. R. An analysis of organizational climate and employee satisfaction in the North Carolina community college system. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, 33(11-A), 6600.
- Saleh, Shoukry D., and Otis Jay L. Age and level of job satisfaction. In Michael M. Gruneberg (ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Sansopone, Wichian. A study of faculty promotion in higher education in Thailand. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, 36(4-A), 1967.
- Schneider, B. Organizational climate: Individual preferences and organizational realities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1972, 56, 211-218.

- Schneider, J., and Locke, E. A. A critique of Herzberg's incident classification system and a suggested revision. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1971, 6, 441-457.
- Schwartz, Milton, Jenusaitis, Edmund, and Stark, Harry. Motivation factors among supervisors in the utility industry. *Personnel Psychology*, 1963, 16(1), 45-54.
- Seegmiller, Jesse F. Job satisfaction of faculty and staff at the College of Eastern Utah. ERIC ED 139 489, 1977.
- Smart, John C., and Morstain, Barry R. Assessment of job satisfaction among college administrators. *Research in Higher Education*, 1975, 3, 1-9.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., and Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1969.
- Snedecor, G. W., and Cochran, W. G. Statistical methods (5th Ed.). Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1972.
- Sprague, Barbara Q. Job satisfaction and university faculty. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, 35(4-A), 2018.
- Sutermester, Robert A. People and productivity (3rd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Tombaugh, George E. A study of the job satisfaction of school business administrators in city school districts in the State of Ohio. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1976, 36(10-A), 6418.
- Varley, P. J. Relationships between teacher satisfaction, sex, age and qualifications. *Administrators' Bulletins*, 1973, 4, 1-4.
- Vroom, Victor H. Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Wahba, M. A., and Bridwell, L. G. Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1976, 15, 212-240.

- Williamson, Thomas R., and Karras, Edward J. Job satisfaction variables among female clerical workers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1970, 54, 343-346.
- Wilson, Robert C., Gaff, Terry G., Dienst, Evelyn R., Wood, Lynn, and Bavry, James L. *College professors and their impact on students*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.
- Wolf, Martin G. The relationship of content and context factors to attitudes toward company and job. *Personnel Psychology*, 1967, 20(2), 121-132.
- Wood, Olin R. An analysis of faculty motivation to work in the North Carolina community college systems. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, 35(2-A), 901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Measuring job satisfaction of the community college staff. *Community College Review*, 1976, 3, 56-64.
- Wozniak, Loretta C. A study of the relationship of selected variables of the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of music faculty in two-year colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, 34(5-A), 2349.
- Yotakong, Somchit. An analysis of some of the job satisfaction in the agriculture teacher's career under the Northeastern Agriculture Schools and Colleges of Thailand. Unpublished master's thesis. Library, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, 1976.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my major professors: Dr. Larry Ebberts, and Dr. Ray Bryan for their guidance and assistance during the pursuit of graduate study here at Iowa State University.

The contributions of other members of my graduate committee: Dr. George Kizer, Dr. Glenn Smith, Dr. Trevor Howe, and Dr. Clifford Smith are gratefully appreciated. An expression of appreciation is extended to Dr. Rex Thomas for his invaluable assistance in statistics. I also wish to thank Prof. Richard Wright who helped correcting the grammatical errors in the first draft.

Special thanks are due to Dr. Olin Wood, Vice President of Instructional Services of Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute, North Carolina for his permission to use the questionnaire instrument in Thailand. My thanks are also extended to a number of the Thai colleagues here at Iowa State University for their participation and efforts in the process of the questionnaire translation.

My sincere gratitudes are expressed to one of my best friends, Dr. Suriyan Nontasak, and some of his graduate assistants at Sri Nakariniwirot University for their hours of labors in collecting and administering of data collection in Thailand.

Finally, the greatest debt I owe to my wife, Saovakon, and my son, Sasatra, who have survived without husband and father during the later part of my graduate career. My profound gratitudes are expressed for their personal investment of encouragement and understanding during the long period of negligence.

APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE  
(English Version)

IOWA STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Telephone 515-294-4143

July 30, 1979

Dear Faculty Member:

As a faculty member in the university, you have been randomly selected to participate in a study of faculty job satisfaction. The purpose of the questionnaire is to collect information for use in the research study which is in partial fulfillment of the requirements of my doctoral degree.

Your responses to the enclosed questionnaire are a crucial part of the project. Its accuracy is entirely dependent upon your willingness to answer the questions. The form includes questions on your involvement in the organization, your opinion on a number of work environments and your background.

Your answers will be held in the strictest confidence. This commitment is assured. I am interested only in the total distribution of the responses and in statistical relationships, and will under no circumstances report your responses on an individual basis.

It is hoped that you will find the questionnaire interesting to answer, and that you will return it in the enclosed stamped, and self-addressed envelope by August 20. I will welcome any comments you might make, and will attempt to answer any questions you might choose to ask. Therefore, please feel free to write to me at the above address or contact one of our friends who is assisting me in this project at the following address:

Dr. Suriyan Nontasak  
Department of Educational  
Administration  
Sri Nakarinwirot University  
Bangsan, Choburi, Thailand

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Sophon Sudsawasd

FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION SURVEYINSTRUCTIONS

1. Respond to each item by checking the appropriate alternative or by entering the requested information.
2. If you have difficulty in responding to any item, give your best estimation or appraisal. You may wish to clarify your response by commenting in the margin or on the back.
3. It is very important that all items have a response.
4. Your anonymity is insured. The identification number above is to insure that responses are obtained from all samples. It will be removed as soon as your response is verified.

For each of the following questions, place a check mark by the best applicable answer. If there is the answer best applicable to you than other those provided, write it in the blocks provided after "other".

1. Institution: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Your sex: \_\_\_\_\_ 2.1 Male \_\_\_\_\_ 2.2 Female
3. Your marital status: \_\_\_\_\_ 3.1 Married \_\_\_\_\_ 3.2 Single
4. Your age: \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months
5. Number of years employed: \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months
6. Highest level of education:  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6.1 Bachelor's degree  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6.2 Master's degree  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6.3 Doctoral degree  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6.4 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
7. Present professional rank:  
\_\_\_\_\_ 7.1 Instructor or lecturer  
\_\_\_\_\_ 7.2 Assistant Professor  
\_\_\_\_\_ 7.3 Associate Professor  
\_\_\_\_\_ 7.4 Professor  
\_\_\_\_\_ 7.5 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Your primary responsibility is: (MARK ONLY ONE)

- 8.1 Teaching  
       8.2 Research (e.g., research associate, institute research, etc.)  
       8.3 Teaching and research  
       8.4 Academic administration (e.g. department head, dean, etc.)  
       8.5 Teaching and academic administration  
       8.6 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

For each of the following items, circle the response which represents your level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Scale

- 1 = Very dissatisfied (VD)  
 2 = Slightly to moderately dissatisfied (MD)  
 3 = Not sure of opinion (NS) or neutral  
 4 = Slightly to moderately satisfied (MS)  
 5 = Very satisfied (VS)

	VD	MD	NS	MS	VS
9. The actual achievement of teaching objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The immediate results from your work.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The actual adoption and use of practices which you recommended.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Personal goal attainment.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Students follow the practice and/or material being taught.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Observing students' growth and success over a period of time.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The extent to which you are able objectively to evaluate your accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Opportunities for increased responsibility in education.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Opportunities provided for growth in education compared with growth in other field.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Participation in in-service education.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Types and levels of in-service education.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>D</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>S</u>
20. Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Opportunities to attend professional conference, workshops, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Friendliness of your co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Cooperation from faculty in your department.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Cooperation from faculty outside your department.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Faculty-student relationships	1	2	3	4	5
26. Professional relationships.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Personal relationship on the job.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Overall institutional relations including faculty, students, and staff.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Your involvement in making decisions	1	2	3	4	5
30. The procedures used to select faculty for promotion to positions such as department chairman.	1	2	3	4	5
31. The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are made available to the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
32. The administrative procedures used to carry out the educational program.	1	2	3	4	5
33. The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed.	1	2	3	4	5
34. The extent to which the policies meet faculty needs.	1	2	3	4	5
35. The educational philosophy which prevails in your institution.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Recognition of your accomplishments by co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Recognition of your accomplishments by superiors.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Your recognition compared to that of your co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5

	VD	MD	NS	MS	VS
39. The recognition you get from the administration for your ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Publicity given to your work and activities.	1	2	3	4	5
41. The authority you have to get the job done.	1	2	3	4	5
42. The total amount of responsibility you have.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Your responsibilities compared with those of your co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Committee responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Responsibilities outside your major areas of interest.	1	2	3	4	5
46. The method used to determine your salary.	1	2	3	4	5
47. The range of salaries paid to instructors in your department.	1	2	3	4	5
48. The top salary available to instructors compared to similar positions in other fields.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Your salary compared to that of people with training in other professions.	1	2	3	4	5
50. The amount of salary.	1	2	3	4	5
51. The earning potential of the faculty compared to that of the administration.	1	2	3	4	5
52. The level of understanding that your supervisors and you have of each other.	1	2	3	4	5
53. On-the-job supervision given by your supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
54. Competence of your supervisor to give leadership.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Personal encouragement given by your superior.	1	2	3	4	5
56. The willingness of your superior to delegate authority.	1	2	3	4	5
57. Authority delegated compared to duties delegated.	1	2	3	4	5
58. Counsel and guidance given by your supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5



	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
59. The initiation of innovations by your supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5
60. The fairness of your supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5
61. The sensitivity of your superiors to your needs.	1	2	3	4	5
62. The consistency of your supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Specific on-the-job training offered by your superior.	1	2	3	4	5
64. Work and association with college-age students.	1	2	3	4	5
65. The interesting and challenging aspects of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
66. The general type of work you do.	1	2	3	4	5
67. Your level of enthusiasm about teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
68. The number of classes or groups for which you are responsible.	1	2	3	4	5
69. The number of hours you work each week.	1	2	3	4	5
70. Your work schedule compared to that of similar positions in other fields.	1	2	3	4	5
71. Your office facilities.	1	2	3	4	5
72. The adequacy of instructional equipment.	1	2	3	4	5
73. The number of course preparations required.	1	2	3	4	5
74. Your work schedule compared to that of your co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
75. Consider all aspects of your job as an instructor and indicate your overall level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.	1	2	3	4	5

Please add any specific comments you may have about your institution which are not covered above. Please return this completed form at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

---



---



---



---

APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE  
(Thai Version)

IOWA STATE  
 UNIVERSITY

Telephone 515-294-4143

มหาวิทยาลัยแห่งรัฐโอไฮโอ เมืองโคลัมเบีย  
มกราคม 50011

1992

ข้าพเจ้าเป็นนักศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์เชียงใหม่ จังหวัดเชียงใหม่ ซึ่งกำลังหาวิทยานิพนธ์  
เรื่องบรรจุภัณฑ์สำหรับบรรจุผลไม้สด ใ้แก่การบริโภค โดยจะขอความรู้จากท่านอาจารย์ เกี่ยวกับกระบวนการผลิต  
อาหารและบรรจุภัณฑ์ของผลไม้สดมาขอปรึกษา

ผมขอตอบว่าเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของวิทยานิพนธ์ของข้าพเจ้า ซึ่งมีวัตถุประสงค์ที่จะศึกษาเกี่ยวกับ  
การเปลี่ยนแปลงในงานรองคณาจารย์ โดยเฉพาะอย่างยิ่งความนึกเห็นของท่านเกี่ยวกับสภาพแวดล้อมรองงาน  
โดยทั่วไป นอกจากนี้จะนำไปเปรียบเทียบเพื่อนำไปหาวิธีลดละ หรือวิธีรับมือกับเหตุการณ์ที่ว่าการ  
สูงๆในหน่วยงานที่ใกล้ชิดกันในประเทศสหรัฐ ว่าจะมีผลกับผู้นับถือศาสนาในสภาพแวดล้อมรองงานท่านใน  
ประเทศเรามากน้อยเพียงใด

เมื่อท่านทบทวนแบบสรณคณานันท์แล้ว โปรดวางใจบนโต๊ะรองท่านครั้นเสร็จ จะมีเจ้าหน้าที่มาเก็บ  
อีกแล้ว จำต้องยืนยันว่าแบบสรณคณานันท์ดังกล่าวจะไม่ได้ออกเผยแพร่เพื่อสนองงานอธิบดีของท่านแต่อย่างใด ถ้าหาก  
ท่านมีข้อสงสัยใจ โปรดติดต่อกับข้าพเจ้าที่ภาควิชาการศึกษามานุษยวิทยา หรือท่านจะสรณคณานันท์ไปยังเพื่อนผู้เคยให้คำแนะนำ  
หรือติดต่อกรรมการแบบสรณคณานันท์ที่ข้าพเจ้าทางเมืองไทยก็แล้ว

คร.สุริยัม ๒๕๕๓

มหาวิทยาลัยอัสสัมชัญ กรุงเทพมหานคร

செய்து

ความเข้าใจในการศึกษาวิจัยครั้งนี้ ขึ้นอยู่กับความรวดเร็ว ตลอดจนความกว้างขวางของ  
ผลการวิจัย ซึ่งทำให้ทราบถึงผลของยา ๒ ใน ๓ โอกาสที่ศึกษา

## รณรงคความมั่นคง

Ben S. J. J.

( ໂຮມ ອຸກສາ-ຊັກ )

ลำดับที่ \_\_\_\_\_

แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับปัจจัย  
ที่มีผลต่อความพึงพอใจงานของคณาจารย์

แบบสอบถามนี้ มีวัตถุประสงค์ที่จะสำรวจความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับปัจจัยที่มีผลต่อความพึงพอใจในงานของท่าน จึงขอได้โปรดเลือกระดับความพึงพอใจของท่านตามระดับตัวอักษรที่กำหนดไว้ แต่หากคำถามยากต่อการวินิจฉัย ก็โปรดเลือกระดับที่ท่านเห็นว่าดีที่สุด โดยอาจจะอธิบายเพิ่มเติมในช่องว่างของข้อสุดท้าย หรือกั้นหลังแบบสอบถามก็ได้ ความคิดเห็นทั้งหมดจะถือเป็นความลับ และใช้เพื่อการวิจัยเท่านั้น

ข้อที่ 1 ถึง 8 ขอไปนี้ โปรดกาเครื่องหมายถูก (✓) หรือเติมคำลงในช่องว่างที่ท่านเห็นว่าถูกต้อง หากไม่มีข้อใดถูกต้องเลย ก็โปรดอธิบายเพิ่มเติมในช่องอื่น ๆ และขอไปโปรดตอบคำถามทุกข้อด้วย

1. ชื่อของสถาบัน \_\_\_\_\_ ภาควิชาหรือคณะ \_\_\_\_\_

2. เพศ \_\_\_\_\_ 2.1 ชาย \_\_\_\_\_ 2.2 หญิง \_\_\_\_\_

3. สถานภาพการแต่งงาน \_\_\_\_\_ 3.1 แต่งงานแล้ว \_\_\_\_\_ 3.2 โสดและอื่น ๆ \_\_\_\_\_

4. อายุ \_\_\_\_\_ ปี \_\_\_\_\_ เดือน \_\_\_\_\_

5. ระยะเวลาที่รับราชการในสถาบันแห่งนี้ \_\_\_\_\_ ปี \_\_\_\_\_ เดือน \_\_\_\_\_

6. วุฒิการศึกษา \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 6.1 ปริญญาตรี

\_\_\_\_\_ 6.2 ปริญญาโท

\_\_\_\_\_ 6.3 ปริญญาเอก

\_\_\_\_\_ 6.4 อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

7. ตำแหน่ง \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 7.1 อาจารย์

\_\_\_\_\_ 7.2 ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์

\_\_\_\_\_ 7.3 รองศาสตราจารย์

\_\_\_\_\_ 7.4 ศาสตราจารย์

\_\_\_\_\_ 7.5 อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

8. หน้าที่การงาน (โปรดระบุเพียงข้อเดียว)

\_\_\_\_\_ 8.1 สอนอย่างเต็มเวลา

\_\_\_\_\_ 8.2 ทำงานวิจัยอย่างเต็มเวลา

\_\_\_\_\_ 8.3 ทั้งสอนและทำงานวิจัยด้วย

\_\_\_\_\_ 8.4 งานบริหาร

\_\_\_\_\_ 8.5 อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

ข้อที่ 9 ถึง 75 โปรดเขียนวงกลม (○) รอบอักษรที่ท่านพิจารณาเห็นว่าใกล้เคียงกับ  
ระดับพึงพอใจหรือไม่พึงพอใจในหน้าที่การงานของท่านมากที่สุด

ก. หมายถึง มีความพึงพอใจมาก

ข. หมายถึง มีความพึงพอใจ

ค. หมายถึง ปานกลาง

ง. หมายถึง ไม่พึงพอใจ

จ. หมายถึง ไม่พึงพอใจมาก

9. ความสำเร็จในผลงานตามเป้าหมายของทางราชการ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
10. ความรู้สึกของท่านที่มีต่อผลงานที่ท่านปฏิบัติ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
11. ข้อเสนอแนะของท่านต่อการพิจารณาหรือปฏิบัติตาม	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
12. ความสำเร็จในเป้าหมายที่ท่านวางไว้	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
13. การเอาใจใส่ของนิสิตในวิชาที่ท่านสอน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
14. ความภาคภูมิใจในวิชาการและความสำเร็จของนิสิต	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
15. ขอบเขตที่ท่านสามารถวัดความสำเร็จในผลงานของท่านอย่างแท้จริง	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
16. โอกาสของท่านที่จะได้รับมอบหมายความรับผิดชอบสูงขึ้น	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
17. โอกาสก้าวหน้าในหน้าที่การงานของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
18. การมีส่วนร่วมในการศึกษาอบรมเพิ่มเติม	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
19. ชนิดและระดับของการศึกษาอบรมเพิ่มเติม	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
20. โอกาสที่จะได้รับความก้าวหน้าในหน้าที่การงานจากการได้รับการศึกษาเพิ่มเติม	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
21. โอกาสเข้าร่วมประชุมทางวิชาการ สัมมนาทางวิชาการที่เกี่ยวข้องโดยตรงกับหน้าที่การงาน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
22. นโยบายของผู้ร่วมงานที่มีต่อท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
23. ความร่วมมือของคณาจารย์ในหน่วยงานของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
24. ความร่วมมือของคณาจารย์ในหน่วยงานอื่น	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
25. ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างนิสิตและอาจารย์	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
26. ความสัมพันธ์ทางหน้าที่การงานกับผู้ร่วมงาน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
27. ความสัมพันธ์ในทางส่วนตัวกับเพื่อนร่วมงาน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
28. ความสัมพันธ์โดยทั่วไประหว่างคณาจารย์ นิสิต และผู้ปฏิบัติงานอื่น ๆ ในมหาวิทยาลัย	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
29. การมีส่วนร่วมในการออกกฎเกณฑ์ระเบียบปฏิบัติงาน หรือการตัดสินใจ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ

ก. หมายถึง ไม่มีความพึงพอใจมาก					
ข. หมายถึง มีความพึงพอใจ					
ค. หมายถึง ปานกลาง					
ง. หมายถึง ไม่พึงพอใจ					
จ. หมายถึง ไม่พึงพอใจมาก					
30. ระเบียบปฏิบัติที่ใช้ในการเลื่อนตำแหน่งการทำงานของอาจารย์ ในมหาวิทยาลัย	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
31. ขอบเขตการมีส่วนร่วมบริหารของคณาจารย์เกี่ยวกับนโยบาย หรือกฎเกณฑ์ทางการบริหาร	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
32. กฎเกณฑ์ในทางการบริหารที่ใช้ในการดำเนินการตามแผน การศึกษา	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
33. ขอบเขตที่นโยบายและกฎเกณฑ์ในทางการบริหารได้รับการปฏิบัติ ตามอย่างเคร่งครัด	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
34. ขอบเขตความสอดคล้องระหว่างนโยบายและความต้องการ ของคณาจารย์	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
35. ประสิทธิภาพการศึกษาของมหาวิทยาลัย	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
36. การยอมรับในผลงานของท่านจากผู้ร่วมงาน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
37. การยอมรับในผลงานของท่านจากผู้บังคับบัญชา	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
38. การยอมรับในผลงานของท่านเมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับผู้ร่วมงาน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
39. การยอมรับในแนวความคิดเห็นของท่านจากผู้บริหาร	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
40. ขอบเขตที่ผลงานของท่านได้รับการเผยแพร่	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
41. อำนาจหรืออิทธิพลที่ท่านได้รับมอบหมายปฏิบัติงานให้สำเร็จ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
42. ความรับผิดชอบทั้งหมดที่ท่านได้รับมอบหมาย	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
43. ความรับผิดชอบของท่านเมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับผู้ร่วมงาน คนอื่น	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
44. ความรับผิดชอบในฐานะที่ได้เป็นกรรมการท่านต่าง ๆ ของ มหาวิทยาลัย	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
45. ความรับผิดชอบอื่น ๆ ที่อยู่นอกขอบเขตงานประจำของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
46. วิธีการที่ใช้ในการกำหนดอัตราเงินเดือนของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
47. ช่วงอัตราเงินเดือนของคณาจารย์ในหน่วยงานของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
48. อัตราเงินเดือนขั้นสูงสุดของคณาจารย์ เมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับ บุคลากรอื่นที่มีตำแหน่งในระดับใกล้เคียงกัน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
49. อัตราเงินเดือนของท่านเมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับบุคลากรอื่น ที่มีระดับการศึกษาหรือวุฒิ เท่าเทียมกัน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ

ก. หมายถึง มีความตั้งใจมาก

ข. หมายถึง มีความตั้งใจ

ค. หมายถึง ปานกลาง

ง. หมายถึง ไม่ตั้งใจ

จ. หมายถึง ไม่ตั้งใจมาก

50. ความตั้งใจเอาเงินเดือนที่ค่าจ้างไว้	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
51. การเปรียบเทียบเงินเดือนอันสูงส่งของอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัย การ เมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับฝ่ายบริหาร	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
52. ระดับความเข้าใจที่ต่างกันระหว่างท่านกับผู้นับถือนับถือในการ ปฏิบัติงาน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
53. ความรู้สึกของท่านต่อวิธีการสั่งงานของผู้นับถือนับถือ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
54. ลักษณะการเป็นผู้นำของผู้นับถือนับถือในการบริหารงาน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
55. การให้กำลังใจหรือสนับสนุนที่ท่านได้รับจากผู้นับถือนับถือ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
56. ความตั้งใจจริงของผู้นับถือนับถือในการกระจายอำนาจ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
57. อำนาจในการตัดสินใจของท่านที่ท่านได้รับมอบหมาย เมื่อ เปรียบเทียบกับตำแหน่งหน้าที่	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
58. การให้คำแนะนำปรึกษาของผู้นับถือนับถือที่ไม่ใช่ท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
59. การวิพากษ์วิจารณ์ของผู้นับถือนับถือ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
60. ความยุติธรรมของผู้นับถือนับถือ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
61. ความฉ้อฉลของผู้นับถือนับถือที่ไม่ใช่ความตั้งใจของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
62. ความเสมอต้นเสมอปลายของผู้นับถือนับถือ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
63. การจัดให้มีการฝึกอบรมเฉพาะอย่างของผู้นับถือนับถือ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
64. การร่วมงานและการสั่งการกับผู้นับถือนับถือ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
65. ความน่าสนใจและความท้าทายของการสอน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
66. ลักษณะงานโดยทั่วไปที่ท่านปฏิบัติ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
67. ความกระตือรือร้นต่อการงานในหน้าที่ของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
68. จำนวนเวลาที่สอนหรือจำนวนเวลาที่ท่านต้องการรับผิดชอบ	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
69. จำนวนชั่วโมงที่ท่านต้องทำงานต่อหนึ่งสัปดาห์	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
70. ตารางการปฏิบัติงานของท่านเมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับตำแหน่ง ที่คล้ายคลึงกันในหน่วยงานอื่น	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
71. ความพอใจของสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวกในหน่วยงานของท่าน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
72. ความพึงพอใจของบุคลากรต่อการสอน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ
73. จำนวนเวลาที่กองเก็บบันทึกการสอน	ก	ข	ค	ง	จ

ก. หมายถึง มีความพึงพอใจมาก

ข. หมายถึง มีความพึงพอใจ

ค. หมายถึง ปานกลาง

ง. หมายถึง ไม่พึงพอใจ

จ. หมายถึง ไม่พึงพอใจมาก

74. ตารางเวลาการทำงานของท่านเมื่อ เปรียบเทียบกับ ก ข ค ง จ

ณารายอื่น ๆ

75. ถ้าจะพิจารณาทุกแง่มุมแล้ว ท่านพอจะระบุถึงระดับความ ก ข ค ง จ

พึงพอใจ หรือไม่พึงพอใจ ที่ท่านมีต่อภาระงานใกล้เคียงใด

ต่อไปนี้ เป็นช่องว่างที่เว้นไว้ สำหรับให้ท่านแนะนำหรืออธิบายเพิ่มเติมในกรณีที่ท่านเห็นว่า  
คำถามข้างต้นนี้ยังครอบคลุมไม่หมด ในสิ่งที่ควรสอบถามเกี่ยวกับความพึงพอใจในงานของท่าน  
ขอได้โปรดเขียนแบบสอบถามที่ท่านได้ตอบเรียบร้อยแล้วโดยรีบด่วนจนจบกระดิ่ง